1920
Se2

A. W. Secord

The Memoirs of Captain Carleton

THE MEMOIRS OF CAPTAIN CARLETON

BY

ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD

A. B. Greenville College, 1916

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

IN ENGLISH

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1920

1920
Se2

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

June 4 1920

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY Arthur Wellesley Secord

ENTITLED The Memoirs of Captain Carleton

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Arts

Ernest J. Bentaum
In Charge of Thesis

Stuart P. Sherman
Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in*

Committee on Final Examination*

*Required for doctor's degree but not for master's

15-21

UIUC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I The History of the George Carleton Problem

Chapter II The Composition of the Solebay Episode

Chapter III The Possible Authorship of the Solebay Episode

Bibliography

Chapter I

THE HISTORY OF THE GEORGE CARLETON PROBLEM

On the 16th of May, 1728, (O.S.), there was published, in London, a volume with the following title page:[1]

> THE / MEMOIRS / OF AN / English Officer, / Who serv'd in the Dutch War in / 1672. to the Peace of Utrecht, in / 1713. / Containing / Several Remarkable TRANSACTIONS both / by Sea and Land, and in divers Coun- / tries, but chiefly those wherein the Au- / thor was personally concern'd. / Together with / A DESCRIPTION of many Cities, Towns, and / Countries, in which he resided; their Man- / ners and Customs, as well Religious as Civil, / interspers'd with many curious OBSERVATIONS / on their Monasteries and Nunneries, more par- / ticularly of the famous one at Montserat. / On the BULL-FEASTS, and other publick Diversions; / as also on the Genius of the Spanish People, a- / mongst whom he continued several Years a Prisoner / of War. No Part of which has before been made / publick. / By Capt. GEORGE CARLETON. / LONDON, Printed for E. Symon, over against the Royal / Exchange, Cornhill. MDCCXXVIII.

Within ten days, a second title page was substituted, and the book reissued as "The Military Memoirs of Captain George Carleton...", with a few other minor changes in the title, and in the dedication and the preface. The date of this reissue (which for convenience will be designated the 2nd edition) has long been assumed to be July 25, 1728, on which day an advertisement of it appeared in the "Evening Post".[2] It was, indeed, until 1893, considered the date of

1 Mr. G.A.Aitken (Academy, vol.43, 1893, p.483) discovered the advertisement of The Memoirs of an English Officer...in the Daily Courant of May 16, 1728. It is barely possible that the real date of publication was even earlier.

2 In 1859, J.Y., a writer in Notes and Queries (2nd ser., vol. vii, pp. 150-1), discovered the notice in the Evening Post from Thursday July 25 to Saturday July 27, 1728:"Just Publish'd. The Military Memoirs of Captain George Carleton..."

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/memoirsofcaptain00seco

the original publication. But it appears now that it is not even the date of the 2nd edition (or reissue), for identically the same advertisement was carried in the "Post Boy" (No. 6063) from Saturday May 25 to Tuesday May 28, 1728, approximately nine days after the 1st edition was placed on sale. A third and a fourth edition appeared in 1741 and 1743, respectively.[1] Then, as in 1728, England was at war with Spain, and the consequent interest in Spanish affairs seems to have been relied upon to sell the book.

As the title suggests, these "Memoirs" purport to recount the military career of one George Carleton from 1672, when as a young gentleman of about 20 years, he took part as a volunteer under the Duke of York in the famous naval battle of Southwold Bay, or Solebay, to the close of the War of the Spanish Succession with the treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Two years after Solebay, that is, in 1674, Carleton enlisted under the standards of William of Orange in the Lowlands where he fought steadily till the temporary lull in 1678, his bravery winning him a place

[1] Mr. C.E.Doble (Academy, vol.43, p.393. See,also, Mr. Aitken's confirmatory note, p.483) has shown that all four of these editions are from a single impression. In the 1st edition, the dedication (to Sir Spencer Compton, Baron of Wilmington) incorrectly addresses Sir Spencer as "Spencer Lord Compton" (p.iii). The 2nd edition (the reissue of 1728) corrects that blunder, and omits, from the address "To the Reader", a postscript in which the reader is desired to overlook some errors in the arrangement of paragraphs (p.viii). In this edition the type for the whole of pp. i-viii were reset. But in the 3rd and 4th editions (1741 and 1743), only pp. i,ii,vii, and viii were reset - the inner fold being taken from stock in the printer's warehouse. Thus, while the title page was altered in both cases, and the postscript on p. viii omitted, the original error concerning Sir Spencer Compton's title reappears. In all four editions, a single leaf (pp. 117-118) has been removed and another inserted.

as ensign in the regiment of Sir John Fenwick. Upon being sent to England with his regiment at the time of the Monmouth rebellion (1685), Carleton left the service of the Prince, and accepted a lieutenantcy in a newly raised regiment commanded by Colonel Tufton, and thus remained in England till after the accession of William and Mary, when his regiment was sent to Scotland; there some unusual exploits at the capture of Lethindy Castle won him a captaincy in the regiment of Brigadier Tiffin, with which (1692) he returned to fight in the Continental wars till the Peace of Ryswick in 1697.[1]

The war being over, Tiffin's regiment was sent to Ireland and from thence to the West Indies; Carleton, however, exchanged places with an half-pay captain, and so escaped going to the Indies. When the War of the Succession opened, he was recommended by Lord Cutts to the Earl of Peterborough, and was appointed to a place on Peterborough's staff, accompanying the expedition to Spain in 1705. Thus he participated in the famous capture of Barcelona, and was active in several capacities, especially as engineer, till wounded and taken prisoner at Denia in 1708. The last third of the "Memoirs" tells of his fortunes as a Spanish prisoner - the customs and character of the people are illustrated with many anecdotes, and many interesting scenes and places are described. With the close of the war (1713), he received his freedom, and leisurely travelled back to England. At this point the account ends.

[1] During this time two trips are made to England: he is returned with his regiment in 1693 to do duty in the Tower, and in 1696 in connection with the disturbance aroused by the assassination plot of that year.

The book, though very readable, seems to have excited little notice[1] until a singular incident occurred in 1784 which had much to do with its later history. On Sunday, June 27, 1784, Dr. Johnson dined with Sir Joshua Reynolds, Lord Eliot, and some others. The conversation, as reported by Boswell,[2] turned upon Peterborough, who, Johnson said, was one of his favorites; he lamented that Peterborough was not better known, his character having been mainly ventilated through party pamphlets. Lord Eliot mentioned the "Memoirs of Captain Carleton" as containing the best account of Peterborough's exploits. "Johnson said he had never heard of the book. Lord Eliot had it at Port Eliot; but, after a good deal of enquiry, procured a copy in London, and sent it to Johnson, who told Sir Joshua Reynolds that he was going to bed when it came, but was so pleased with it, that he sat up till he had read it through, and found in it such an air of truth, that he could not doubt of its authenticity; adding, with a smile...'I did not think a young Lord could have mentioned to me a book in the English history that was not known to me.'"[3]

1 Besides the advertisements of the 3rd and 4th editions in the various newspapers during 1741 and 1743, I find the former listed in the "Bibliotheca Smithiana, seu Catalogus Librorum D. Josephi Smithii Angli per Cognomina Authorum Dispositus. Venetiis ...MDCCLV", p. xciv.

2 Boswell, James; Life of Johnson, vol.iv,(ed.1887,pp.333-4).

3 Three other 18th century notices of the "Memoirs" may be mentioned. (1) In 1786, they were listed as fiction in "A General Catalogue of Books...published in London from the year 1700 to 1786...Printed for W. Bent." (2) In 1790, James Petit Andrews quoted one of its anecdotes (concerning the bravery of the Duke of York) in his "Anecdotes...Ancient and Modern" (p.170). (3) Dr. Thomas Somerville, in his Reign of Queen Anne (1798), rejects the Memoirs as untrustworthy.

As a probable result of Dr. Johnson's remarks[1], the "Memoirs" were soon to attract the attention of the great novelist, Sir Walter Scott, whose interest in the Spanish patriotic outburst against Napoleon's actions at Bayonne, led him, in 1808, to reissue them[2], with a lively preface and with notes, as authentic history. The following is an extract from Scott's preface[3]:

> "...It is obvious that Capt. George Carleton was one of those men who chuse the path of military life, not from a wish to indulge either indolent or licentious habits, but from a feeling of duty...There is a strain of grave manly reflection through the work which speaks the author accustomed to scenes of danger, and familiar with the thoughts of death...His style is plain and soldier-like, without any pretence at ornament; though, in narrating events of importance, its very simplicity gives it occasional dignity. Of the author after deliverance from his Spanish Captivity, we know nothing; but can gather from some passages in his Memoirs, that it did not correspond with his merits."

New fortunes, however, were in store for the "Memoirs". When Walter Wilson published his "Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe" in 1830, he concluded on superficial evidence, perhaps, that they were none other than a fiction by Defoe.[4] Their general resemblance to the "Memoirs of a Cavalier", and the simi-

1. Boswell's Life of Johnson was published in 1791.

2. Lockhart, J.G.;The Life of Sir Walter Scott, vol.iii,(ed. 1902, p.74).

3. This 1808 edition was published by Archibald Constable and co., Edinburgh. The quotation from its preface is taken from an article by John Besley in Notes and Queries, 2nd ser., vol. vii, p.93.

4. Wilson, Walter; Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, vol.iii, (ed.1830,pp.589-591). The sarcasms on duelling, the moral reflections, the political allusions, and the plain matter-of-fact manner of telling the story, Wilson thought, all suggest Defoe.

larity of some passages to passages in acknowledged works of Defoe, induced him to say that probably Defoe has the best title to their authorship. This entirely novel position was agreed with by Lockhart, when, seven years later, he brought out his "Life of Scott"; though impressed with the "inimitable air of truth" of the "Memoirs", he was not so sure that Defoe's genius was not responsible for that.[1]

The Defoe tradition received further support from the incorporation, by Tegg and Hazlitt, of the "Carleton Memoirs" into an edition of Defoe's writings published in 1840. Likewise, the 1857 edition of Lowndes' "Bibliographers Manual" lists the "Memoirs" with Defoe's writings, but adds: "This valuable and interesting work...has been likewise attributed to Dean Swift..."[2] And in 1866, G.L.Craik, in his "History of English Literature and of the English Language", unquestioningly attributes the "Memoirs" to Defoe as a work of fiction.[3]

1 Vol.iii,(ed.1902, p.74). "It seems to be now pretty generally believed," adds Lockhart, "that Carleton's Memoirs were among the numberless fabrications of Defoe; but in this case...as in that of his 'Cavalier", he no doubt had before him the rude journal of some officer who had fought and bled in the campaigns described with such an inimitable air of truth."

2 Lowndes, W.T.;The Bibliographers Manual, vol.i, (ed. Bohn, 1857, p.614).

3 Craik, G.L.; A Compendium History of English Literature and of the English Language from the Norman Conquest, vol.ii,(ed.1866, pp.272-3). Craik contrasts the truthful air of Defoe's fiction with Swift's, and mentions that numbers of Defoe's works have been cited as authentic history: Dr. Mead quoted from the Journal of the Plague Year; the Earl of Chatham recommended to his friends the Memoirs of a Cavalier as the best account of the Civil War; and Dr. Johnson read the Memoirs of Captain Carleton without a suspicion of their being untrue.

Meanwhile, Lord Stanhope had come to the support of Dr. Johnson and Sir Walter Scott by publishing his account of the War of the Succession,[1] in which he produced, from the papers of his ancestor, General Stanhope, a list of the prisoners taken at Denia in 1708; in that list is the name "Captain Carltone", which was immediately seized upon as sufficient proof of the authenticity of the "Memoirs", whose account Lord Stanhope proceeded to use freely.

Lord Stanhope's credulity in no way surpassed that of a small group of investigators who discussed the Carleton puzzle in "Notes and Queries" in 1858 and 1859, and continued a scattering fire on the subject up until about 1890.[2] Their most substantial contribution was made in 1864, when M.E.S. (evidently a soldier, since he gave Brompton Barracks as his address) found in the records of the army in Ireland the following significant letter:[3]

> "Ormonde, These are to pray and require you..... to pay unto Captain George Carleton.... the Sume of 27l. 12s. ster. on acco^{t} of halfe pay due to him according to the Establishm^{t}....Given....the 20th of February, 1704 (1705). Edward Southwell To her Ma^{ts} Vice-Treasurer of this Kingdom..."

1 Stanhope, Philip Henry, 5th Earl; The History of the War of Succession in Spain, (ed.1832, app. p.135). The author, who was then known as Viscount Mahon, based his account mainly on papers left by his ancestor, General James, 1st Earl Stanhope.

2 Beta (Notes and Queries, 2nd ser., vol.vi,pp.392-394), finding the contents "indisputably such as no professional narrator could well conceive, much less fabricate," and being unable to find a possible George Carleton to father them on, was of the opinion that a certain historical Lancelot Carleton (d.1730) who had been a military chaplain and who had served in Spain, had written the Memoirs.

3 Notes and Queries, 3rd ser., vol. vi, p.375. The letter to Ormonde was found in a folio book entitled: "Warrants relative to the Army in Ireland, 1703-1705," additional manuscripts 9765, fol. 119.

Here was not only an evident reference to the Carleton of the "Memoirs", but one tending to confirm the account given in those memoirs.

During the decade from 1860 to 1870, Captain Percival Carleton was carrying on an extensive investigation preparatory to writing his "Memorials of the Carletons", and incidentally contributing considerably to our knowledge of the historical Captain Carleton. Though Captain Percival Carleton was evidently not a scholar, he was an industrious investigator, and identified Captain George Carleton beyond the peradventure of a doubt, as the following quotation[1] from his "Memorials" will show:

> "In the preface to the Memoirs (Carleton's) the author describes himself as being born at Ewelme, Oxfordshire, and as a great nephew of the Lord Dudley Carleton. He further intimates...that he had a company in Tiffin's Regiment, and that after the Peace of Ryswick, he was placed on half-pay...Now a reference to the genealogy of the Oxfordshire Carletons will show that the Lord Dudley Carleton had three nephews: Sir John, whose only son died in 1650...Sir Dudley, who left four daughters; and George, of Ewelme, whose children were under age in 1654...as Captain George Carleton, according to his own account, was born in 1652, the presumption is that he was a son of the latter. At the Dublin Custom House, there is a copy of the Royal warrant, dated..... 28th of October, 1700, placing 'Captain George Carleton of Tiffin's Regiment,' on half-pay; and a reference to Betham's 'List of Wills' will show that administration of the goods and effects of 'Captain George Carleton, of Tiffin's Regiment', was granted at Dublin, 3rd Sept., 1730, to a Margaret Westmoreland."

This last is a curious instance of the inaccuracy of Captain Percival Carleton; for Colonel Arthur Parnell has shown[2] that the administration of the deceased Carleton's goods was granted to a cer-

[1] Carleton, Captain Percival Augustus; Memorials of the Carletons, p. viii.

[2] English Historical Review, January, 1891, p.109.

tain Mary Toms, of St. Margaret's Parish, Westminister.

Scanty and inaccurate as this may be, it remains the closest identification of Captain George Carleton with his ancestry, though Colonel Parnell is not sure that it is correct. At any rate, the citation of the warrant placing Carleton on half-pay is, like the letter to the Duke of Ormond , quoted supra, in strict accord with the "Memoirs"; while the account of Carleton's will, with the corrections which Colonel Parnell has made, is a valuable addition to our slender store of fact concerning the soldier's life. Beyond doubt, Carleton was a flesh and blood figure, and no mere figment of Defoe's imagination.

With all this evidence, it is small wonder that we find William Lee, in his edition of Defoe (1869), rejecting the "Memoirs"; he declared himself unable to find any evidence, internal or external, to justify attributing them to Defoe; and that he found Carleton to have been a real person and the writer of his own memoirs. With this decision, Mr. James Crossley, an eminent 19th century authority on Defoe, agreed.[1]

In line with this, two of the three histories of the reign of Queen Anne appearing between 1872 and 1880, regarded the "Memoirs" as undoubtedly genuine. Lord Stanhope's account was published in 1872,[2] and he relied as freely on them as he had done forty years earlier in his history of the War of Succession. But Lord Stanhope was not more certain of the matter than was John Hill Burton whose three volume history appeared in 1880. In-

[1] Lee, William; Daniel Defoe, vol.i, pp. 438,9.

[2] Stanhope, P.H.,5th Earl; History of England comprising the Reign of Queen Anne, vol. i, p. 217, note 7.

fluenced no doubt by the opinion of his fellow-countryman, Sir Walter Scott, Burton dismissed the case for Defoe in these sarcastic terms:[1] "The reasons for Defoe's authorship are a curious instance of illogicality in the conditions. The work is so exactly what a plain intelligent man, who had seen and taken part in all that he narrates, would have made it, that it must be the work of the cleverest imitators." Dr. Johnson's estimate was nearer the truth, thought Burton, who continues:

> "It was only when the ample statements from the seat of war, stored in the British Museum, became available through the Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts, that the accuracy of Carleton's story could be subjected to a conclusive test. The result is in the first place to clear off even the possibility of Defoe's authorship, because he could not have discovered the fundamental facts of the narrative without access to documents jealously guarded in the private repositories of those who held them as confidential."

The argument resolves itself to this: that the events narrated are of such a nature that Defoe could not have had access to them, and that any inventions of the imagination would have been instantly denounced. Burton has, therefore, accepted the "Memoirs" as the statement of an officer and a gentleman endowed with the faculty of accurate and animated narration, and throughout worthy of reliance accordingly.[2]

1 Burton, J.H.; Reign of Queen Anne, vol.ii, p.173ff.

2 The third history of Anne's reign referred to, that of F.W. Wyon, makes the curious blunder of relying on the history of Lord Stanhope while denying the genuineness of the "CarletonMemoirs". Thus he is led into the amusing error of recounting the whole romantic episode of Peterborough and the Duchess of Popli at the capture of Barcelona, which (so far as I can learn) has no other foundation than the Carleton Memoirs. It is scarcely necessary to add that other portions of his history are vitiated through his injudicious confidence in the reliability of Lord Stanhope's work.

Burton's arguments were all summed up in Mr. Ormsby's article on Carleton in the "Dictionary of National Biography" (1887); for Leslie Stephen had become convinced of the authenticity of the "Memoirs"[1] and had enrolled Carleton among the worthies of the realm. The best proof of the merits of the "Memoirs, thought Mr. Ormsby, are the efforts to claim them as fiction; but what mainly entitles its author to a place in the "Dictionary" is its importance as a piece of historical evidence bearing on a period for which trustworthy information is scarce.

And thus the matter stood till Colonel Arthur Parnell published his "History of the War of the Succession in Spain" in 1888.[2] Previously to that time, as he has pointed out, practically every 19th century history of the Peninsular campaigns used the "Memoirs of Carleton" as authentic[3] - that was the easy procedure with scarcity of other materials and the opinions of Dr. Johnson and Sir Walter Scott favoring it. On the other hand, practically

1 Stephen, Sir Leslie; Hours in a Library, vol.i, (ed. 1907, p.4). Sir Leslie regarded it a tribute to Defoe that the Memoirs should ever have been attributed to him.

2 English Historical Review, vol. vi (1891), p. 106.

3 Parnell cites the following list of historians and other writers who have been misled by the Carleton Memoirs: Coxe, Marlborough (1813), and Bourbon Kings (1818); Watts, Bibliography, (1824); Stanhope, War of Succession and Reign of Queen Anne; Gleig, Eminent Commanders (1832); Dunham, Spain (1833); Macaulay, Essay on Stanhope's War in Spain, (1833); Dunlop, Spain (1834); Cannon, Official Records (1837-50); Wallace, History of England (1839); Warburton, Peterborough (1853); Cust, Annals (1858); Kuntzel, Prince George (1859); Lee, Defoe (1869); Hamilton, Grenadier Guards (1874); Noorden, Spanische Erbfolgekrieg (1874); Wyon, Queen Anne (1876); Dyer, Modern Europe (1877); Norris, Age of Anne (1877); Wilson, Berwick (1883); Napier, Johnson (1885); Russell, Peterborough, (1887); Henty, Bravest of the Brave; and Ormsby, article on Carlein the Dictionary of National Biography.

every 19th century collection of Defoe's works included these "Memoirs". And strangely enough, both sides appeared to be perfectly satisfied with this contradictory state of affairs; that the truth of the matter might be found by investigation never seems to have occurred to either side, though during the whole of the century the British Museum was placing great quantities of unsearched manuscripts at the convenience of investigators, and countless privately owned papers and letters were being published.[1]

With boundless industry, Colonel Parnell had searched great stores of records, both on the continent and in England and Ireland, and had left no stone unturned to get at the facts in the case. The main problem to be solved was in connection with that erratic hero of Lord Macaulay, the Earl of Peterborough, who commanded the expedition to Spain which effected the famous capture of Fort Montjuich and of Barcelona. In the face of persistent rumors that the victory was rather in spite of his lordship than because of him, Peterborough had Dr. John Freind issue an account of the campaign,[2] which, however, presented no evidence other than Peterborough's unsupported word. So uncertain are the facts concerning his whole career that he seems more like a hero of legend than an historical personage. To the character of Peterborough,

[1] "That men of the calibre of Lord Stanhope and Lord Macaulay ...should have deliberately abstained from making proper investigations into a matter on which they so unhesitatingly published their ideas is, I think, one of the curiosities of modern English literature." Parnell, Arthur; Defoe and the Memoirs of Captain Carleton, Athenaeum, 2 March, 1899, pp. 279, 280.

[2] Account of the Earl of Peterborough's Conduct in Spain, 1706.

Colonel Parnell deals a severe blow. William O'Connor Morris wrote that, though too severe on him, Parnell had exploded the undeserved estimate of Peterborough, and had done justice to the great Huguenot, Galway.[1]

Incidentally, some things had been done for the "Carleton Memoirs". Previous students of the problem believed that the authenticity of the "Memoirs" depended upon whether Carleton was a real or a fictitious person; and that accounts for their complacency on finding a historical Captain George Carleton whose career in some points at least paralleled the account given in the "Memoirs". Here, said they, is a flesh and blood man perfectly capable of writing his own memoirs: why mention Defoe in connection with what is obviously a true and genuine record?[2] But Colonel Parnell, while he does vastly more toward identifying Carleton,- finding indeed that he was a captain in Tiffin's regiment; that he was retired on half-pay in 1700; that he went to Spain with Peterborough in 1705; that he was captured at Denia in 1708; and that he was a prisoner in Spain to the end of the war in 1713, all very much as the "Memoirs" set forth,- at the same time shows the "Memoirs" to be largely a collection of plagiarisms.[3]

1 Academy, May 12, 1888, p.319.

2 "Defoe already has undying fame," said Mr. Markland (Notes and Queries, 2nd ser.,vol.vii,pp.11,12); "why deprive a gallant officer the honor of a faithful narrative of his professional life?"

Similarly Mr. Besley had written (Notes and Queries, 2nd ser.,vol.vii,p.93):"One need...feel no compunction in attempting to reinstate a fine old soldier in his rights, even though the result may be to withdraw one of his aliases from the True Born Englishman."

3 English Historical Review, vol. vi (1891), p.97ff.

In the earlier part of the book, some thirty pages covering the period from 1674, when Carleton is said to have joined the Prince of Orange's guards, to the battle of St. Dennis in 1678, the thread of the story and many of the incidents related Colonel Parnell shows to have been taken from the "Memoirs" of Sir William Temple. Not only are the two accounts similar in content, but here and there are phrases and sometimes whole sentences and paragraphs showing unmistakeably that the earlier book is the source of the later. With minor exceptions, Parnell finds no further plagiarisms till we come to the account of the war in Spain, in which part the story is manifestly taken from the "Account" of Dr. Freind mentioned supra. The plagiarisms here (the most numerous of all thinks Parnell) are too evident to be questioned.

In the remaining portion (about one third of the whole), dealing with the five years imprisonment in Spain, and the return to England, the borrowings are from the "Letters" of the Countess d'Aulnoy,[1] and from the "Miscellanea" of Temple. Many of the descriptions are amplified from d'Aulnoy. That Countess had travelled from France into Spain, describing some half-dozen towns which she had passed through; Carleton, on his way to England, journeyed from Spain into France, visiting identically the same half-dozen towns and in precisely the reverse order. The only borrowing from Temple's "Miscellanea" is a somewhat doubtful one in reference to Don Quixote's having laughed away Spanish chivalry.

[1] La Mothe, Marie Catherine, Comtesse d'Aulnoy; "The Ingenious and Diverting Letters of the Lady -'s Travels into Spain..," 2nd ed., 1692.

Having demonstrated the presence of fictitious passages in the "Memoirs", Colonel Parnell gave a decidedly new turn to the matter by arguing ably and at great length that the real author was neither Carleton nor Defoe, but no less a person than Jean Swift.[1] A number of things make this conclusion plausible - indeed highly probable - at first sight. The author was beyond doubt a warm admirer and champion of Peterborough, and based his account of that nobleman's career upon the "Account" compiled from Peterborough's own papers by Freind. Swift and Freind were both staunch friends of Peterborough. To this should be added the facts that, in 1728, both Carleton, a needy veteran of 76, and Swift were living in Dublin; that Swift is known in one other instance to have aided such another old soldier to publish his memoirs;[2] that in April, 1727, Swift came to London on six months leave; and that in June, 1728, he retired to a country place, conceivably to devote himself to composition. The supposition is that, having picked up some notes or jottings from his needy fellow-townsman, Swift carried them to Peterborough in London, who added further material from his own papers, and, in the summer of 1728, with the aid of the works of Freind, Temple, d'Aulnoy, and others, framed the narrative which has for nearly two centuries baffled historians.

Colonel Parnell, moreover, finds in the "Memoirs" a satiric tone; a general stylistic resemblance to "Gulliver's Travels" and other authentic works of Swift; a sneering attitude toward

[1] English Historical Review, vol. vi (1891), p. 97ff.

[2] The Memoirs of Captain Creichton, 1731. Parnell points out that the Creichtons and the Irish Carletons were closely related.

the Irish ; and a classical tone beyond the "illiterate" Defoe, all suggestive of Swift. Parnell further insists that there are some eighteen generals and higher officers either purposely maligned or purposely ignored in the "Memoirs", and that against each of these Swift cherished bitter hatred; and adds that Swift, having edited the works of his kinsman, Temple, would therefore be more likely than another to make use of them.

Against the authorship of Defoe, Parnell pleads his illiteracy, his sturdy manly honesty, his sincere and earnest religious views, and the absence of any known connection between Defoe and Peterborough, Defoe and Carleton, or Defoe and many of those maligned in the "Memoirs". More significant is Parnell's attempt to prove that Carleton himself could not have written the "Memoirs". Though he does not deny that Carleton may have furnished some of the material - on the contrary, he is convinced of it - he is certain that parts of the book could not have been written by any military man. He detects a satirizing tone toward military life and military men - criticisms of duelling and drinking (Carleton was cashiered for duelling), and theological and religious discussions that place Carleton hors de combat. It seems to Parnell that, of all men, a soldier would be the least likely to forge an account of his career. Furthermore, there is an interest manifested throughout in politics and in the general conduct of affairs not to be looked for from a subordinate officer. The omission of certain events in which Carleton must have participated, and the narration of others in which he could not have participated, render it improbable, in Parnell's opinion, that he had any hand in shaping the final form of the "Memoirs". Strangest of all,

why should Carleton, an old man with one foot in the grave, lend himself to slandering the Earl of Galway, who at several critical points in Carleton's career proved his benefactor?

Colonel Parnell is, however, so interested in proving the "Memoirs" a fiction composed by Swift that his arguments must be accepted with caution. Determined to reconcile the praise of Lord Cutts with Swift's well-known hatred of him, Parnell distorts the plain statement of the "Memoirs" and squeezes from it an ironical meaning. The same procedure is necessary in the case of William III. Other weaknesses appear in Parnell's arguments. Why should Carleton's advanced age prevent his having composed the slanderous book? No one would argue Defoe's age as a reason for his not being the author; and yet in 1728 Defoe was quite as near the grave as Carleton. Many of the events of the earlier portion of Carleton's career were, furthermore, unknown to Parnell, who assumed, because he could not verify them, that the statements in the "Memoirs" concerning that period were probably untrue. A great lack of accurate knowledge of Defoe and of his works is manifest in all Parnell's treatment; anyone who speaks of the "sturdy manly honesty" or of the illiteracy of Defoe is scarcely qualified to give an opinion on what Defoe may or may not have written.

Two years elapsed before Mr. C.E.Doble took up the challenge given by Colonel Parnell, and came to the rescue of the Defoe faction. With a wide and accurate knowledge of the late 17th and early 18th centuries, a remarkable acquaintance with the life and writings of Defoe, and excellent literary judgment, Mr. Doble was peculiarly qualified to speak in the matter. For years he had

been connected with the Clarendon Press at Oxford, and had spent his leisure on the history and literature of the later Stuarts.[1]

Accepting Colonel Parnell's account of Carleton's life and of the plagiarisms as correct, Mr. Doble[2] concerns himself only with the contention that Swift was the author. He points out that Stella died in January, 1728, and that the "Memoirs" were publish- soon afterward, making highly improbable for Swift to have under- taken such a task at that time. There is an even stronger obstacle to Parnell's supposition that when Swift retired to the country in the summer of 1728 he was occupied with composing the "Memoirs", and that is that the "Memoirs" were on the market before the sum- mer of 1728. The suggestion that the "Memoirs" were written with the knowledge and aid of Peterborough is disposed of by quoting a letter from Pope to Aaron Hill, written in 1731, which shows con- clusively that Pope, another very close friend of Peterborough, knew absolutely nothing of this supposed attempt to make use of Peterborough's papers to rescue him from the oblivion into which he had fallen.[3]

Mr. Doble then proceeds to examine the substance of the "Mem- oirs" minutely, and, from his wide intimacy with the multifarious

[1] See the notice of his death in the Athenaeum, 1914, p.332.

[2] Doble, C.E.; The Memoirs of Captain Carleton; Swift or Defoe? Academy, vol.43 (1893), pp. 393, 438, 461, and 482.

[3] An extract of Pope's letter (dated April 4, 1731) follows: "I happen to know many particulars relating to the Earl of Peter- borough's conduct, and just glory in that scene you draw so well; but no man ought...to attempt what you aim at...except himself. I have long pressed him to put together many papers lying by him, to to that end. On this late occasion he told me you had formerly endeavored the same, and it comes into my mind that on many of those papers I have seen an endorsement, A.H., which I fancy might be those you overlooked." Elwin and Courthope; The Works of Alex- ander Pope, vol. x, (ed.1886, p.24).

writings of Defoe, develops a strong case for his authorship. The change in the title; the errors and the carlessness in the dedication;[1] the similarity of the preface to that of the "Memoirs of a Cavalier"; the character of the classical allusions and quotations (which, Mr. Doble says, are frequently "according to zeal rather than knowledge"); the obvious familiarity of the author with both Spain and London; the anecdotes; the vocabulary; the moralizing on duelling and on predestination, and the complacent protestantism; the trite mannerisms; the frequent use of grenades by the hero; the praise of Sir Richard Steele, Lord Cutts, William III, and others,- all these, illustrated with an amazing accumulation of details, point strongly to Defoe.

The only attention Mr. Doble pays to the sources of the "Memoirs" is in pointing out that Defoe had previously used two or more their anecdotes. Otherwise, his examination is as complete as it could well be; and he concludes: "That he (Carleton) was simply a cloak for Defoe I have no doubt; while I have equally little doubt that Defoe, after his manner worked up Carleton's anecdotes and reminiscences into literary shape."[2]

At this point, two important additions to the facts of Carleton's life should be mentioned. One of them had been made by Mr. Doble as early as 1889. No previous investigator had discovered

[1] In this connection, Mr. Doble points out that Swift would have been very unlikely to dedicate a book to Sir Spencer Compton at that time. Sir Spencer had just failed in his attempt to form a ministry, and Walpole's position was made stronger than ever. Indeed, Swift had written in February of 1728, "As to Richmond Lodge and Market Hill, they are abandoned as much as Sir Spencer Compton." (Scott's Swift, xvii, ed.1814, p.206).

[2] Academy, vol. 43 (1893), p. 483.

any trace of the real Carleton earlier than 1697, in which year Parnell had found that he was a captain in Tiffin's regiment as the "Memoirs" claim. But for the preceding quarter of a century nothing was actually known of Carleton until Mr. Doble discovered[1] two letters written in his interest in the years 1684 and 1685, respectively, by Dr. John Covel, chaplain to the Princess of Orange (1681-5). Dr. Covel had evidently been requested by some one of importance to use his influence to secure a captaincy for Carleton, and the letters were written in compliance therewith. In the second of these was an enclosure which reads:

> "Mr. Carlton hath been tenn yeares in the service of the Prince, 7 yeares as a voluntier, 3 yeares an Ensigne in S^{r} Hen Bellasis his regiment. He was at the Battel of Seneife, and the Seidge of Mastricht, where he was wounded. The Captaines place void is one that is cashierd, his name is not knowne, but it is thought to be in S^{r} Hen. Bellasis his regiment. He hath been at Sea wth S^{r} Edw. Spragg."

Here is a useful sketch of Carleton's life from 1672, at which time the "Memoirs" open, to 1685; and, excepting slight discrepancies in the matter of dates, concerning which the "Memoirs" are usually rather vague, it disagrees with the "Memoirs" only in giving Sir Henry Bellasis' regiment as that in which Carleton was ensign rather than Sir John Fenwick's.

According to the "Memoirs", Carleton came to England with his regiment at the time of the Monmouth rebellion in 1685, shortly Dr. Covel had written the second of the above mentioned letters. From then till after the Revolution of 1688-9 he is said to have remain-

[1] Academy, 6 July, 1889, p. 10. The letters are from the Tanner Collection (Mss. 31.61) in the Bodleian Library. Both were written from Honslaerdike; one was to Bishop Sancroft, and the other to Dr. H. Paman.

ed in England, during which time he quitted the service of the Prince of Orange, secured a lieutenantcy in Colonel Tufton's regiment, and about 1690 gained a captaincy in Tiffin's.

Though unable to locate a Lieutenant George Carleton in Tufton's regiment, Parnell did, however, find a Villar Carleton who had been made an ensign within a year or so from the date suggested in the "Memoirs". And this Villar Carleton he supposed to have been a relative of George Carleton and to have furnished material for the ensuing portion of the "Memoirs". But, in 1894, Mr. Charles Dalton, who had a few years previously published an army register,[1] produced copies of commissions showing that not only were George Carleton and Villar Carleton the same individual, but, also, that the account of this period of George Carleton's career as given in the "Memoirs" is substantially true.[2] According to these commissions, Villar Carleton was made ensign January 1, 1687-8.[3] On March 1, 1689-90, —— Carleton was appointed lieutenant to Major Tankred in Sir James Leslie's (late Tufton's) regiment of foot. This, Dalton thought, was doubtless Viller Carleton promoted in the ordinary course. The next commission is dated two years later: "Commission to Villiers Carleton, esq., to be Capt. of the company of which David Lindes was late Capt. in the regiment of foot commanded by Zacharia Tiffin, dated at Whitehall, 21 March,

[1] English Army Lists and Commission Registers, London, 1892.

[2] Academy, vol. 46 (1894), p. 104.

[3] The English Army List and Commission Registers (vol.ii,p.147) gives the name as 'Oiller' instead of 'Viller'.

1691(2)." To cap it all, a manuscript army list for 1694[1] contains, in a list of Colonel Tiffin's regiment, the name, "Captain George Villars Carleton, March 21, 1691(2)." And Dalton, apparently irritated by the attempts of Colonel Parnell and Mr. Doble to prove the "Memoirs" fictitious, concludes in triumph, "On the principle that the devil is not so black as he has been painted, I believe that Captain George Villiers Carleton was not such a consummate liar as has been represented. " No matter how unwarranted Mr. Dalton may be in believing the "Memoirs" genuine, there is no doubt that he has supplied the last piece of evidence needed to connect the Mr. Carleton who had "been at sea with S^r Edw. Spragg" and "tenn yeares in the service of the Prince", with the Captain George Carleton of Tiffin's who was cashiered in 1700 for duelling, and who accompanied Peterborough to Spain in 1705.

Since the exposures of Colonel Parnell, historians have on the whole taken a conservative attitude toward the "Memoirs". William Stebbing, in his "Peterborough"[2], seems inclined to believe that they may be genuine, though he speaks of them as one of the mysteries of literature. "Probably," he says, "the share of the editor who put the materials into shape was rather less, and the share of the old officer who lent his name rather more than it has become of late the fashion to concede." Furthermore, he finds the "Memoirs" too free from vituperation for Swift and too poorly done for Defoe. Professedly following Stebbing, the Honorable J.W. For-

[1] Add. MS. 17,918.

[2] Peterborough, English Men of Action Series, p.55.

tescue[1] goes much further and makes use of some episodes from the "Carleton Memoirs".[2]

While careful historians have been rejecting the "Memoirs" as unauthentic, writers on Defoe, on the other hand, have been diffident about attributing them to him. Thomas Wright, in his "Life of Defoe" (1894), following the list compiled by William Lee, omits the "Memoirs" from among Defoe's works; and, likewise, the much greater scholar, Mr. Aitken, omits them from his edition of Defoe's narratives brought out in 1895, feeling that "the only safe course is to...reject everything which does not bear convincing proof of genuineness."[3] Mr. E.A. Baker has gone farther still, and says they are "probably authentic memoirs."[4] A definite assertion of their authenticity has been made by Michael Barrington, who, apparently influenced by Dalton, quoted a passage relating to the hero of Killiecrankie from them in his beautifully printed "Grahame of Claverhouse" (1911).[5]

1 A History of the British Army, London: 1899.

2 The following recent histories have either ignored the Carleton Memoirs entirely, or have mentioned as untrustworthy:
(1) The Political History of England, (Hunt and Poole, Editors), vol. ix, 1906.
(2) The Cambridge Modern History, vol. v, 1909.
(3) The Cambridge History of English Literature, vol.ix, 1913.
(4) Memoirs as a Source of English History, (The Stanhope Essay, by Rice-Oxley), 1914.

3 Robinson Crusoe, (ed. J.M. Dent and co., p. x).

4 A Guide to the Best Fiction in English, ed. 1913, p.13. The Memoirs are listed under Carleton's name.

5 Professor Saintsbury (Encyclopedia Britannica, vol.vii, ed.9, p.29) says that the Memoirs have been attributed to Swift "with greater probability (than to Defoe) as far as style is concerned." Likewise, Arundell Esdaile, in his English Tales and Prose Romances, places the Memoirs under Defoe's name, but says that the attribu- to Defoe is doubtful.

The Defoe theory, meanwhile, has been championed by no less a person than Professor Trent of Columbia University, the eminent authority on Defoe.[1] Not only has he warmly supported the position taken by Mr. Doble, but has also done some further research on his own account, the results of which are still unpublished.

Such, for nearly two centuries, have been the fortunes of the "Memoirs". Their authenticity has been asserted by Dr. Johnson, Sir Walter Scott, Lord Stanhope, William Lee, James Crossley, J.H. Burton, Mr. Ormsby, Sir Leslie Stephen, Charles Dalton, E.A.Baker, and Michael Barrington. Colonel Parnell, with some slight comfort from Professor Saintsbury, has supported the cause of Dean Swift. The chief supporters of the Defoe claim have been Walter Wilson, Lockhart, Craik, Lowndes, Mr. Doble, and Professor Trent. Other investigators, notably Thomas Wright and Mr. Aitken, have remained neutral.

From this mass of conflicting evidence and conjecture, two facts appear to me to be obvious. Firstly, that practically every new fact discovered concerning the historical Carleton tends to confirm the account given of his career in the memoirs attributed to him. Secondly, that the closer the contents of the "Memoirs" are analyzed the more untrustworthy they appear, and the more they point to Defoe as their author. In fact, granting that Carleton could not have written them in the main himself, the conclusion already rendered so highly probable by Mr. Doble, becomes as cer-

[1] (1) Cambridge History of English Literature, vol. ix, chap. 1, (ed. 1913, p.25).
(2) Trent, W.P.; Daniel Defoe, pp. 210, 262, 263, and 264.

tain as anything may be which lacks direct external testimony. To that conclusion only one thing is wanting: the establishing of a probable connection between Carleton and Defoe. Until such a connection is established (or at least rendered very probable), or until it is conclusively demonstrated that Carleton could not have been the author, there remains the chance that the "Memoirs", though far from being authentic or trustworthy, were compiled by the old captain. The very fact of his name's being attached to them creates in his favor an antecedent probability which cannot be lightly ignored.

Before the question of the authorship can be definitely determined, however, or the degree of authenticity ascertained, it is necessary to find whether the literary sources of the book are sufficiently known. To draw stylistic conclusions from a given portion without being reasonably sure that that portion is the actual work of the author or authors, and not borrowed literally or substantially from previously written matter, is a manifest waste of time. The only intensive search for the sources of the "Memoirs", of which I am aware, is that of Colonel Parnell. Intent on proving them fictitious, he discovered those three important works mentioned above, from which the author drew a considerable part of his materials. Parnell's study was, however, not exhaustive, nor, as will appear later, were his conclusions entirely correct; for the "Memoirs" of Sir William Temple were only indirectly utilized. So that sources for the narrative of the first thirty years of Carleton's military career - some seventy pages of the "Memoirs" - are still to be discovered, though Parnell suggest-

ed possible sources for certain episodes, and Mr. Doble has shown that a few of the anecdotes had been used elsewhere by Defoe.

The plagiarisms from Freind's "Account" cover the years from 1705 to 1707 - approximately eighty pages of the "Memoirs" appear to be merely a condensation of the "Account". Sources for the remainder of the book, about one hundred and eighty pages, are unknown except for the copious but scattered borrowings from the d'Aulnoy "Letters". It should be noted, however, that in this portion of the book, dealing with Carleton's five years as a prisoner in Spain, the narrative is relatively slight; descriptions and anecdotes take up the major part of the author's attention - matters which were probably gathered from numerous sources, many of them difficult to determine. Assuming that Defoe was the author, much of this would be from his own experiences; for he, as well as Carleton, had spent considerable time in Spain.

The importance of the questions at issue becomes apparent when we are reminded that, in spite of all that has been done to discredit the genuineness of the "Memoirs" and to prove that Defoe was their author, most students have remained unconvinced. Between the fear of historians that it may be fictitious, and the fear of literary investigators that it may be genuine, the book is being quite generally neglected. Many readers who are familiar with Defoe's "Colonel Jacque", "Memoirs of a Cavalier," and "Duncan Campbell," are wholly unacquainted with the "Memoirs of Captain Carleton". This is owing to the fact that the only two recent editions of Defoe's narratives,- the Aitken (1895) and the Maynadier (1903),- have, through an excess of caution, omitted these

"Memoirs", though including a number of works inferior to them.

It is manifestly not sufficient to show that portions of the "Memoirs" are fictitious: the whole must be reinvestigated and fact sifted from fiction. The Carleton myth must be annihilated. So long as considerable fragments of it remain undestroyed, it may revive. The problem of authorship must be definitely settled, and the "Carleton Memoirs" brought into place with the "Memoirs of a Cavalier", "Captain Singleton," and the rest of Defoe's fictions.

The relation of the "Carleton Memoirs" to the whole Defoe problem is significant. Students of Defoe have long been puzzled by the quantity of literary productions. A bibliography of his multifarious writings, as compiled by Professor Trent for the "Cambridge History of English Literature"[1], occupies thirteen large and closely printed pages. It is almost incredible that one man should have written so much, and various explanations have been advanced to account for it. It has been conjectured that Defoe had a "double" whose style was indistinguishable from his and who wrote some of the works attributed to him. One suggestion, reminiscent of the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, is that "Robinson Crusoe" was the work of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, by whom Defoe was long employed on matters of state.[2]

Much more plausible, however, is the explanation offered by Professor Bernbaum,[3] who points out that "not all of Defoe's supposedly fictitious narratives can be confidently denominated either

1 Vol. ix, pp. 467-481.

2 See an article by W.L.Purves, Athenaeum, 2 May, 1903.

3 The Mary Carleton Narratives, pp.6,7.

absolute fact or absolute fiction," and that a number are known to have a "groundwork of fact."[1] He continues:

> "In the reaction against Wright's tendency to accept Defoe's assurances of authenticity at their face value, it is assumed that at least some of his novels ...were wholly derived from their author's imagination. But the fact that others of them are...based upon published sources, suggests the necessity of investigating the Defoe mystery anew. If, as I believe likely, journalistic and biographic sources shall be eventually found for all Defoe's great novels, the fact that he is so voluminous will seem less astounding."

As we shall see, the method of composition of the "Carleton Memoirs" supports Professor Bernbaum's surmise. The present study will consist principally in an attempt to determine more accurately than has yet been done the sources of these reputed memoirs in the newspapers, pamphlets, and histories extant in 1728, and to present some hitherto unnoticed evidence of Defoe's connection with their composition. Especial attention will be paid to the opening events of the narrative.

[1] The Mary Carleton Narratives, p.86.

Chapter II

THE COMPOSITION OF THE SOLEBAY EPISODE

The "Carleton Memoirs" open with an account of the famous battle of Solebay (or Southwold Bay), which occurred in the year 1672. It will be recalled that, war having been declared against Holland by England and France early in that year, de Ruyter, the Dutch Admiral, on the 28th of May, surprised the combined English and French fleets commanded by the Duke of York (later James II) in Solebay, and engaged them in a long and bloody fight. With this engagement, George Carleton is said in the "Memoirs" to have begun his career. A young gentleman of about twenty years, he had with many others attended the Duke of York aboard the fleet, and served in the battle as a "voluntier" on Sir Edward Spragge's ship, the London.

Ten pages of the "Memoirs" are devoted to an account of events connected with the battle, which precedes by two years the later adventures of the hero. I purpose to examine this episode closely; because, complete in itself and detached from the rest of the narrative, it represents, or may represent, the whole book in miniature, and a study of its contents and of the manner of its composition may furnish a key to the method of writing the entire work. If this one complete and detached episode proves to be a genuine memoir, the fact will not be without significance. If, however, we find that another hand than Carleton's has composed it as a whole or in part, there will be the more complicated problems of determining whose was that hand, and what is the

amount of fictitious matter.

No effort, so far as I am aware, has previously been made to test the genuineness of this opening account, and to discover to what extent it is based on the experiences of the real Carleton, and to what extent on accounts in the newspapers and histories of the times. Finding no way to test the statements of the "Memoirs" on this episode, Colonel Parnell passed on to other matters; and Mr. Doble did little beyond pointing out a number of stylistic resemblances to acknowledged writings of Defoe.[1] To him, however, we owe the only external evidence we possess that Carleton really may have been at Solebay. Attention has been called to the two letters written in Carleton's interest by Dr. Covel in 1684 and 1685 respectively. Dr. Covel, at the time chaplain to the Princess of Orange, was trying to secure for Carleton a captaincy in one of the English regiments serving under William of Orange in the Lowlands, and enclosed in his second letter a memorandum of Carleton's decade of service for William prior to 1685, adding as an afterthought apparently, "He hath been at Sea with S^{r} Edw. Spragg."

This assertion is, in all probability, true; unfortunately, it does not specify just when or where Carleton served with Sir Edward. As the latter, however, perished in the fight of August 11, 1673, Carleton's experience with him could not have been later than that; and taking into account his career in general, it seems probable that he was too young to have served with Spragge before

[1] Academy, vol. 43 (1893), pp. 393, 438, 461, and 482.

1672. For Spragge had been employed in the Mediterranean for three years prior to that year, returning only in time to participate in Solebay, and had Carleton been with him during his absence he must have gone to sea at least before the end of 1669. The "Memoirs" state that he was about twenty years old in 1672, and, while this is not to be relied upon implicitly, it is probably very nearly correct. From the indefinite manner in which the information is appended to Dr. Covel's enclosure[1], it would appear that Carleton's naval service was of short duration; otherwise, more would have been made of it as a recommendation for promotion. If we grant that Carleton was not at Solebay, we must admit, of course, that there is no basis of fact at all in the first, and one of the principal episodes of the "Memoirs", and that the author either was totally ignorant of, or totally indifferent to this period in his hero's career. But, considering that later parts of the "Memoirs" parallel rather closely the events of his life, the more probable assumption is that Carleton was with Spragge aboard the London at Solebay.

This battle was the culmination of a month of maneuvering.[2]

1 Mr. Doble (Academy, 6 July, 1889, p.9) says that the memorandum is not in Dr. Covel's handwriting, and thinks, from its contents, that it is not in Carleton's either.

2 Accurate and detailed accounts of Solebay are scarce. There is a brief on in The Political History of England (Hunt and Poole, Editors), vol. viii, pp.110,111; more particulars may be found in the Calendar of State Papers, dom. ser., May 18 to Sept. 30, 1672, (1899), passim; and in the London Gazette for May and June, 1672. Perhaps the most useful accounts are to be found in the Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth, vol.iii,(Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fifteenth Report, Appendix, Part I, pp.6-23); the interesting journal of Sir Edward Spragge contains a report of the battle; there is, also, a more formal account by him, as well as accounts by several other notable English seamen present.

Early in May, 1672, the English fleet, commanded by the Duke of York, had sailed from the Nore to join the French under D'Estrees in St. Helen's Road. The Dutch admiral, de Ruyter, was on hand, but his attempt to prevent the union was unsuccessful. The combined fleets made up three squadrons; the French, under D'Estrees, formed the White Squadron, while the English formed two: the Blue with the Earl of Sandwich as commander, and the Red, of which Sir Edward Spragge was vice-admiral. About May 23, the Duke of York sailed with the three squadrons to Southwold Bay on the coast of Suffolk, where de Ruyter attacked him early on the morning of May 28th. Though taken by surprise, the English fought obstinately. The gallant Earl of Sandwich, commanding the Blue, met the Dutch resolutely, and his valor saved the allies from a total defeat. It cost him his life, however, for, after a desperate struggle, his ship, the Royal James, was burnt, and he was lost trying to escape from it; thirteen days later his body was discovered floating on the sea some twenty miles from the scene of the disaster.

The Duke of York was compelled to change ships twice during the action; first from the Prince to the St. Michael, commanded by Sir Robert Holmes, and, later in the afternoon, to the London, commanded by Spragge, vice-admiral of the Red. Spragge bore a brilliant part in the fighting, and was credited with having sunk an enemy vessel of between sixty and seventy guns. Though the Royal James was the only English ship lost, several others were badly damaged. The Catherine, captured by the Dutch, was recovered by her own crew. Her commander, Sir John Chicheley, was taken prisoner, and a large number of notable men, with several hundred

seamen, were slain. The Dutch losses were heavy also; Admiral Van Ghent was killed, and several ships were sunk.

The fight continued till nearly ten at night; de Ruyter attempted to renew the conflict the following day, but was prevented by the fog. Both sides claimed a victory; continental opinion, however, seems justified in favoring the Dutch. Throughout, the French took little part in the fighting, and the English were not slow in claiming that D'Estrées had orders to stand by while the two maritime rivals, England and Holland, destroyed each other's fleet.[1]

Such are the generally accepted facts of what the "Memoirs" set forth as Carleton's first adventure, in which, it is claimed, he served as a volunteer under Sir Edward Spragge on board the London. Assuming for the moment that Carleton was at Solebay, let us consider what sort of memoir of the event might reasonably be looked for from him fifty six years later. He was about twenty years old, and it was his first fight - in fact, it appears to have been his only naval encounter. For all of these reasons it would impress itself on his memory. Being aboard the London, Carleton would quite naturally concern himself with the fortunes of that vessel. First of all, some brief explanation of how he came to be assigned to the London, and what his duties were there might be expected. He should relate what were the preparations of the London to meet the enemy on the morning of the attack. Particular attention should be paid to the part she bore in the

[1] See a statement by Andrew Marvell made in 1678: Works, vol.iv, (ed. Grosart, p.294).

battle, and to the damage she gave to, and received from the enemy. The London belonged to the Red Squadron of which her commander, Spragge, as has been repeatedly stated, was vice-admiral. Therefore, Carleton would deal more intimately with the fortunes of Spragge and of the Red than with those of Sandwich and of the Blue. This does not mean, of course, that the generally known facts of the battle might not be related even though they were remote from Carleton and the London. It does mean, however, that the London would be the center of both his interest and his knowledge, and that in general other events would lose in both in direct proportion to their remoteness from that center. In any case, the actions in which Carleton participated personally would naturally form the major portion of the narrative.

Such, with reasonable allowances, is the kind of memoir we have every right to expect. A survey of this opening episode, however, reveals the surprising fact that we get nothing of the sort. The account is a very general summary of the battle, such as a popular history might give, without the slightest mention of Carleton's duties or actions during the fighting. It mentions the beginning of the war with Holland, the junction of the English and French fleets in St. Helen's, and the decision to go to Solebay, where a few days later the Dutch attacked them. The battle as a whole is summarized in a paragraph. Of the remaining ten paragraphs, one relates the conduct of the admiral, the Duke of York; another, the fate of the Royal James and of the Earl of Sandwich; a third, the fortunes of the Catherine; two brief ones are devoted to a list of the Englishmen killed; another brief one tells

of some notable men who gained experience in the battle; the Dutch losses occupy still another short paragraph; while the remaining three narrate anecdotes which are not of an historical character. Every one of these, except the information as to the Duke of York's conduct and two of the anecdotes, relates not to the London and the Red Squadron, but to Sandwich and the Blue.

The closest scrutiny reveals few elements which have the appearance of being the personal experiences or recollections of George Carleton - facts concerning himself and his own ship. Making the most generous allowances, there are but eight of such items to be found. It is to be emphasized that the great majority of these relate to Carleton only in the sense that they are said to have been witnessed by him, and not that he participated in them. The following arrangement of the data is in the order in which they are recounted.

1. 1672, George Carleton (not named, as the story is related in the first person), about 20 years old, a gentleman volunteer with Sir Edward Spragge aboard the London, (p.1).

2. Incident of the Duke of York's taking refuge on the London; his bravery attested, (pp.3,4).

3. Incident of the finding of the body of the Earl of Sandwich, (pp.4,5).

4. Anecdote of a man on the London who, though a brave duellist, was so terrified by the fire of battle that he asked his comrades to tie him fast so he could not run, (pp.6,7).

5. Sir George Rooke mentioned as lieutenant to Spragge, (p.9).

6. Carleton reported to have seen the wreck of an enemy ship standing out of the water, (p.8).

7. Anecdote of Spragge's pigeons which instinctively change ships whenever their master does. This closes the account of Solebay, (pp. 9,10).

8. Carleton leaves the fleet soon after the battle, (p.10).

Of these eight items, only the first and the last, briefly relating his entrance into, and his exit from the navy, concern Carleton personally. The second, describing the conduct of the Duke of York, loses for our purposes much of its importance from the exalted position of its subject. The bravery of the Duke on this occasion was well-known. Bishop Parker's "History", published the year previously to the "Memoirs of Carleton", was one of many which attest this.[1] Parker not only dwells on the bravery of the Duke, but relates, in more detail than the "Memoirs" do, how he changed ships twice during the action, finally taking refuge on the London. The particular details which Carleton is said to have witnessed relate to the Duke's bold exposure of his person on deck while the bullets "whizz'd" past; so far from shrinking, he is said to have rubbed his hands and cried, "Sprage, Sprage, they follow us still." If these particulars as related in the "Memoirs" are true, they were unquestionably to be found in contemporary accounts of the battle, even though not recorded in the scanty reports in the "Gazette". The conduct of the admiral of a fleet in a great battle, especially when that admiral is the son of one king, brother to another, and destined to be king himself, does not wait fifty six years to be made known through the memoirs of an obscure old soldier who was only a young volunteer at the time of the events related. As a matter of fact, a number of pamphlets dealing with the Duke's naval and military career ap-

[1] History of his own Times, pp. 150-154.

peared in the half-century preceding the "Carleton Memoirs", though these are now scarce and difficult to obtain.[1] If, however, a thorough search failed to reveal a published source for the incident, one would be justified in entertaining grave doubts of the event's having occurred at all. It is not, of course, impossible that, though previous accounts did exist, the author of the "Memoirs" was independently of them delineating an event of which Carleton, as is claimed, was an eye-witness. But in the light of the plagiarisms which Colonel Parnell has discovered, and of those from the "London Gazette" which I shall shortly disclose, this appears very unlikely, especially as the incident is recounted with the same air of personal detachment as are others which happened on ships with which Carleton had no connection.

The third item, relating to the discovery of the body of the Earl of Sandwich, has sufficient basis in the "London Gazette". First of all, it should be made clear that, two years after the battle of Solebay, Carleton is said in the "Memoirs"[2] to have grown tired of the inactivity at home and to have gone to serve under William of Orange in the Lowlands. Now the author of the "Memoirs" seems unquestionably to have had this journey in mind when he composed the account of the incident under consideration. The "Gazette"[3] reported that on June 10, 1672, the body of Sandwich was found floating at sea and brought to shore at Harwich by

1 For example, see a volume entitled: Some Historical Memoires of...James Duke of York...to this present year 1682.

2 P.11.

3 Number 685.

a ketch. Carleton is made to pretend in the "Memoirs" that in his passage from Harwich to the Brill (near Rotterdam) a year or two later, he learned of the fact from the master of the packet boat on which he was travelling, this master being none other than the discoverer of the body. On the surface this might appear plausible enough were it not for a discrepancy into which the author has fallen through his hasty and somewhat careless method of composition. For, when the Solebay episode is finished and Carleton, tired of his two years of inactivity, is ready, in the summer of 1674, to go to the Lowlands, he does not go by way of Harwich and the Brill.[1] On the contrary, his route is by way of Dover, Calais, Dunkirk, and Brussels! Which of these two routes Carleton really travelled will probably never be known; the author of the "Memoirs" may not have known. But that Carleton did go to Holland before August, 1674, is quite certain from external evidence supplied by the enclosure to Dr. Covel's letter, which has been mentioned more than once before. This letter was written from Honslaerdike, Holland, in May of 1685, and the enclosure states that Carleton had then been "tenn Yeares in the Service of the Prince", and that he was at the "Battel of Seneife" which occurred in August of 1674. Had he gone to fight on the continent much earlier than that, he would have been credited with more than ten years of service in May of 1685. It seems to be beyond dispute that he did go to the continent sometime in the summer of 1674, as the "Memoirs" state. If so, his most direct route would have been the second one given in these memoirs; for the Prince of Orange had his army

[1] P. 11.

stationed then at Nivelles, about twenty miles southwest of Brussels, and Dover, Calais, and Dunkirk are almost in a direct line with London and Brussels. Harwich is north of London, and the Brill and Rotterdam are far north of Brussles; so that, had Carleton gone through them, he must have travelled considerably out of his way.

The manner in which this glaring discrepancy occurred (if anything may be called glaring which has not been remarked in 192 years) is obvious. The author of the "Memoirs", seeking to connect his hero with so interesting an event as the discovery of Sandwich's body, noticed in the "Gazette" that the body was found somewhere near Harwich, recalled that Harwich is the usual place for taking passage to Holland, and so happened on this future journey of Carleton as a scheme for the connection. It was only when he came to write of Carleton's career in the Lowlands that he discovered (through Boyer's "History of William III")[1] that William's army was not in Holland at all, but at Nivelles, southwest of Brussels in Belgium, as has been stated. By that time, however, he had either forgotten about, or lost interest in the incident of the Earl's body.

This explanation becomes the more certain when it is shown on other grounds that the episode as related in the "Memoirs" is full of fictitious statements. Whether or not any detailed accounts of the finding of the Earl's body were published prior to 1728, I have not been able to discover; but a number of letters

[1] Vol. i, p.49. At some future time I hope to show the dependence of the author of the Memoirs on Boyer's work (1702,3) for a large portion of his narrative.

and reports throwing considerable light on the event are available for us in the "Calendar of State Papers".[1] In the first place, they make clear that the body was not discovered by the crew of a packet boat as the "Memoirs" claim, but by some seamen from the Gloucester, a war vessel, who were out in a ketch trying to recover some of the Gloucester's equipment which had been lost on a place called the Sunk - apparently a sandbar of some sort somewhere off the coast. Other statements in the "Memoirs" are equally untruthful. It is related there that this master of the packet boat was led to his discovery through seeing a great flock of gulls hovering over the body, which came nearly being returned to the waves "as the Corpse of a Dutch Man"; and that there was "found about him between twenty and thirty Guineas, some Silver, and his Gold Watch; restoring which to his Lady, she kept the Watch, but rewarded their Honesty with all the Gold and Silver." The fact is that the body was not discovered by the presence of gulls: the ketch was "sweeping and labouring" to recover some anchors, and happened on the body. None of the authentic reports mention the presence of fowls, though it seems that the corpse was surrounded with porpoises. The statement of the "Memoirs" that "the Sailors would have returned it (the body) to the Sea as the Corpse of a Dutch Man; but keeping it in his Boat, it proved to be that of the Earl of Sandwich," does not agree with the facts. It is well attested that the Earl was in his clothes, and decorated with the Order of the Garter. So dressed he would certainly not

[1] Dom. ser., May 18 to Sept. 30, 1672, (1899), pp.191-207.

pass long for a Hollander, though his corpulent figure might favor the misapprehension.

For the statement concerning the gold watch and the money found on the Earl's clothing there seems to be a slight basis in fact; a gold watch is actually recorded among the articles so found. But beyond that item the account in the "Memoirs" appears to be wholly fictitious. A correspondent of Sir Joseph Williamson, then a secretary in the naval department, mentions seeing,[1] besides the watch, three elaborately jewelled rings which he describes, and his George, the jewelled pendant to the collar of the Order of the Garter. There is no word of any money, either silver or gold. Thus, the whole episode connected with this pretended journey of Carleton from Harwich to Holland turns out to be largely fictitious, with no more basis than the brief announcement in the "Gazette" that Sandwich's body had been found at sea and brought to Harwich.[2]

A basis for the seventh item, Carleton's claiming to have seen the wreck of the enemy's ship which had been sunk, is like-

[1] Silas Taylor; Calendar of State Papers, dom. ser., May-Sept., 1672, pp. 191-207.

[2] The Memoirs are apparently in error in reporting that the pretended finders of the corpse restored the watch and money to the Earl's widow who retained the watch but allowed them to keep the money as a reward for their honesty. While it is very likely that the Earl's effects were returned to Lady Sandwich, if,indeed, she was still living, the actual channel through which they passed was somewhat less direct than the Memoirs seem to imply. Certain it is that whatever articles were found were sent by Captain Coleman of the Gloucester to Sir Joseph Williamson; how he disposed of them we can only surmise. There is no mention of Lady Sandwich in any of the accounts, either in the Gazette or the Calendar of State Papers, which have to do with the finding of the Earl's body and with its interment.

wise to be found in the "Gazette",[1] which asserts that the whole fleet saw it. Omitting the fourth item, the anecdote of the cowardly duellist, we find, in the fifth, the statement that Sir George Rooke (who, of course, was not Sir George till later) was youngest lieutenant to Sir Edward Spragge. As the young George Rooke and George Carleton were thus shipmates, the incident at first glance gives promise of some especial knowledge on the part of Carleton, but that promise is dissipated when the author proceeds in the same sentence to relate that "Mr. Russel, afterwards Earl of Orford, was Captain of a small Fifth Rate, called the Phoenix; Mr. Herbert, afterwards Earl of Torrington, was Captain of a small Fourth Rate, called the Monck; Sir Harry Dutton Colt, who was on board the Victory, commanded by the Earl of Ossory, is the only man now living that I can remember was in this Engagement." Our author is determined to be impartial; to prevent the reader's inferring too much from his knowing that Rooke was a lieutenant on the London, he goes on to show that he knows equally well about the Phoenix, the Monck, and the Victory.[2] As Rooke, Russel, and Herbert were later (than 1672) to become prominent naval leaders, information concerning them was not scarce. Singularly enough, Russel died late in November, 1727, some six months before the "Memoirs" were published - probably while they were being composed - and the facts of his life (involving, also, the

[1] Number 684.

[2] The Memoirs are certainly in error here; for Torrington appears to have commanded the Dreadnought, not the Monck. (Dictionary of National Biography, vol. ix, (1908), p.621ff.;also, Calendar of State Papers, dom. ser., May 18 to Sept. 30, 1672, (1899), p.89.)

careers of Rooke and Torrington, who had both died earlier) would be fresh in the author's mind.

There remains still to be considered the fourth and seventh items in the list: one relating to the cowardly duellist - the other to Sir Edward Spragge's interesting pigeons. Neither, however, throws any light on Carleton's conduct, being merely impersonal anecdotes of curious events which he is said to have witnessed.

This completes the survey of the personal touches in the first episode of the "Memoirs". What is the result? There are eight passages which promise something in the nature of personal knowledge or experience, but in every case, except two, the promise is belied. Two of those passages are based on the "London Gazette"; another is more than likely taken from a similar source; a fourth is given casually in company with others far removed from the pretended author; and two are merely anecdotes that anyone might relate and attribute to the occasion. The personal element in a ten page narrative simmers down to the two statements that (1) Carleton, a young gentleman of about twenty, was a volunteer aboard the London with Sir Edward Spragge at the battle of Solebay in 1672, and that (2) shortly after the engagement he left the fleet. It is evident, therefore, that this part of the "Memoirs" could have been fabricated with no more knowledge of what George Carleton did or saw on the 28th of May, 1672, or, for that matter, in his whole life prior to 1673, than is contained in Dr. Covel's memorandum:

"He hath been at sea with Sr Edw. Spragg."

The author, then, would place him aboard Sir Edward's ship, the London, in one of the most famous events of Spragge's career; estimate his age and rank from general circumstances and from his later career; and assume that he left the navy soon after the battle, as a volunteer would be quite likely to do when the crisis was past.

But did not Carleton see anything worth recording besides the bravery of the Duke, the cowardice of the duellist, and the pigeons of Sir Edward? Where was he while the bullets "whizz'd" past the Duke and duellist? Was he exposed to no danger? Was he wounded? Was he frightened? It was his first fight. What were the nature of his duties? We search in vain for any trace of such matters. The author knows what a strenuous fight the Royal James put up before sinking; he knows about the Catherine: that she was captured by the Dutch, that her sailors recovered her, and even that she was commanded in later times by the Earl of Mulgrave who had a painting of her made in his house in St. James Park; further still, he knows that a certain "very fine Gentleman" aboard this ship was devoured by hogs - he has not failed even to remember that gentleman's name. But does he know anything about the London? He remembers a long list of persons killed aboard other ships; is it not significant that not one of those in his casualty list was on his own ship? One would imagine, if he did not know otherwise, that Sir Edward kept her out of the fighting, so little is recorded of her exploits. Is it possible that a man who had been in a great battle could write so much and tell so little of what he himself actually saw and experienced?

Of the Dutch losses, the "Memoirs" mention but one ship, the account of which, as will be shown, is apparently a garbled version of what the "Gazette" reports of two ships. But the "Gazette" reports the sinking of some half-dozen enemy vessels, for one of which Sir Edward Spragge is given credit; and Sir Edward mentions sinking a large enemy vessel in his report of the fight.[1] Strangely enough, the author of the "Memoirs" says nothing of all this. Can it be that Carleton helped sink an enemy ship, and failed to record the fact in his memoirs? The more reasonable assumption is that the compiler of the narrative, like many other well-informed Englishmen, believed that, with the proverbial inaccuracy of newspapers, the "Gazette" had somewhat exaggerated the enemy losses, and that the battle was in reality a Dutch victory.

But whether or not Sir Edward sank an enemy vessel,[1] there is no doubt that the London bore a prominent part in the fighting, and one naturally wishes to know why the "Memoirs" tell nothing of it; why the author mentions so few events which occurred aboard his own vessel in proportion to those he relates as happening on other vessels; why, though he gives a long list from memory of those killed elsewhere, he records no casualties among his own shipmates; and why he mentions not a single act performed by himself, or a single incident in which he was either an active

[1] The London Gazette (no. 684) gives a list of the enemy's vessels reported lost; one item reads: "...a fourth (sunk) by Sir Edward Spragg...betwixt 60 and 70 Guns." The statement is corroborated by letters in the Calendar of State Papers (dom. ser., May 18 to Sept. 30, 1672, 1899, pp.163-5), and in Spragge's formal report of the battle (Dartmouth Manuscripts, vol. iii, pp. 15, 16, and 17).

or passive participant. The answer is obvious: the author was not at Solebay, and had to make use of such materials as were at hand when fabricating the story.

The result of our investigation has been to discover in the "Memoirs" a total absence of any matter, other than the bare statement of his entrance to,and his exit from the fleet, that personally concerns George Carleton, and that, whoever was the author of these memoirs, that author was not present during the occurrence of the events described. The next step is to find, if possible, where the information for compiling the narrative were obtained. The "London Gazette" offers one convenient source, and a comparison of the accounts given therein with the one given in the "Memoirs" shows that the latter is taken in part from the "Gazette", either directly or from some intermediary work which I have not yet been able to discover. Neither Boyer nor Temple, whose works provided such convenient materials for later parts of the Carleton narrative,gives any account of Solebay; and Parker's "History" could have been only of general use. Kennett's "History" follows the "Gazette" substantially,[1] but changes the wording somewhat, so that though it was probably consulted, it apparently does not form the basis of the Carleton story, which bears much greater resemblance to the "Gazette" accounts. The passages which most clearly owe their origin to the "Gazette" will now be compared with those from which they were, directly or indirectly, taken.

[1] Complete History of England, vol. iii, p.288.

"Carleton Memoirs",pp.1,2.

"The Fleet set Sail...about the beginning of May, in order to join the French Fleet, then at Anchor in St. Hellens Road, under the Command of the Count de Estree."

"London Gazette", no.674 Thursday May 2 to Munday May 6, 1672.

"Whitehal, May 5... the Count d'Estrees, Vice-Admiral of France, was with the Squadron of French Ships arrived at St. Helen s...His Royal Highness... was passed...with His Majesties Fleet...in order to his conjunction with the said Squadron."

P.2.

"...We sailed directly towards the Dutch Coast, where we soon got sight of their Fleet; ...the Galloper lying between ...it was resolv'd...to sail directly to Solebay, which was accordingly put in Execution."

No. 680. Thursday May 23 to Munday May 27.

"Whitehal, May 23...we weighed and stood to the Southward; at five a Clock we saw the Dutch Fleet...at 12 we passed by the Galloper...At eight a Clock we were before Sould Bay..."

P.3.

"It was about Four in the Morning of the 28th of May... when we first made the Discovery; and about Eight...the Blue Squadron...began to engage...the Amsterdam Squadron ...The Fight lasted till Ten at Night..."

No. 681.

"Southwold, May 28.past Nine at Night. About five... this Morning His Majesties Fleet... discovered the Dutch...about Seven the Dutch engaged with the Blew Squadron... they ceased from Firing between Eight and Nine this Night."

Attention should be called to the fact that, though the author of the "Memoirs" twice copies the "Gazette's" use of the qualifying word "about" with regard to the precise hours at which the events occurred, he persists in every case in differing by one hour from the "Gazette" as to what those hours were.

Pp. 4,5.

"...the Royal James...(after strenuous Endeavours...to disengage her from two Dutch Fire Ships...one athwart her Hawsers ...) took Fire, blew up, and

No. 681 (Continuation of the previous account)

"...the Royal James being overprest with Men of War and Fireships, a Flag Ship laid himself thwart his haw(?)se...three Fireships attacked the Royal James two of which he sunk; the other

took place and burnt him..."

(Note this sentence from Kennett's "History", p. 288.
"...the Royal James...was at last burnt...and the Noble Earl (of Sandwich) perished in her with many brave Gentlemen...").

perished; and with her a great many brave Gentlemen...amongst the rest the Earl (of Sandwich) himself, concerning whom I shall further add, that in my Passage from Harwich to the Brill, a Year or two after, the Master of the Pacquet Boat told me, That...discovering a Corpse... it proved to be that of the Earl of Sandwich...

"Gazette," No. 685.

"Harwich, June 10.

This day the Body of the...

Earl of Sandwich (was) discovered ...by one of His Majesties Ketches..."

P. 5 (Continued)

"...the Katherine was taken, and...Sir John Chicheley made prisoner,

her Sailors soon after finding the Opportunity they had watched for, seiz'd all the Dutch Sailors...and brought the Ship back...together with all the Dutch Men Prisoners..."

No. 681 (Continued)
"Alborough, May 28. Ten at Night. ...the Catherine was taken, and Sir John Chichely...put aboard of the Dutch Ships, and all the Men under the Hatches... the Prisoners...found a way to break out upon the Dutch, and redeemed...their Ship, and a-

bout 16 or 17 of the Dutch Prisoners are brought ashoar..."

P. 7.

"The Names of those English Gentlemen who lost their Lives, as I remember, in this Engagement."

No. 684.
"Whitehal, June 9.
We have this following List of Persons of Note have been Killed and wounded in the late engagement."

There follows in both cases a list of the casualties, though these lists differ somewhat. The author of the "Memoirs" arranges the names and titles in sentence form, whereas the "Gazette" gives them in double columns, as the "Memoirs" do in other instances; the "Gazette's" list is much the more complete, though the "Mem - oirs" add a few names not to be found in the "Gazette", and occasionally gives additional information about the rank and fortunes

of those mentioned; for instance, where the "Gazette" lists "Mr. Digby, Capt.of the Henry", the "Memoirs" have, "Mr. Digby, Capt. of the Henry, second Son to the Earl of Bristol;" likewise, after the name of "Sir Fretchvile Holles, Capt. of the Cambridge", is added the information that "he lost one of his Arms in the War before, and his Life in this."

The remarkable thing, however, is not that the lists differ, but that they are so much alike. Is it not a striking coincidence (if it be a coincidence) that an old soldier, in giving from memory the list of those killed fifty six years before in his first battle, should be able to recall so much of it with names, titles, and all like those in the "Gazette"?

A curious evidence of the hasty and inaccurate manner in which the list was compiled for the "Memoirs" lies in the following paragraph:[1] "Sir Philip Carteret, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Cotterel... with several other Gentlemen unknown to me, lost their lives... on board the Royal James..." In the "Gazette"[2], that portion reads: "Sir Philip Cartwright, Sir Charles Harbord...Mr. Cotterel..." ; at the bottom of the list is an estimate of the whole number slain not counting "those lost in the Royal James." Apparently, the author of the "Memoirs", having hastily transcribed "Cartwright" as "Carteret", made the further error of overlooking Sir Charles Harbord's title and first name, and of changing his surname to Herbert. It is conceivable, though scarcely probable, that the error was an oral one - that two men were at work, one digging the

[1] Memoirs, p.8.

[2] No. 684.

items from the "Gazette" and other sources, and dictating them to the other who might easily enough be so careless or so inexpert as to mistake the sound of "Harbord" for "Herbert", especially as the latter name was pronounced "Harbert".[1]

From the account of the English losses, the "Memoirs" pass to the brief notice of those of the Dutch. Here again the "Gazette" has influenced the Carleton version. It is to be noted that in both the "Memoirs" and the "Gazette" a paragraph devoted to the Dutch losses follows immediately the English casualty list.

"Memoirs", p.8.	"Gazette", No. 684
"...the Dutch had one Man of War sunk though so near the Shore that I saw some part of her Main Mast remain above Water."	"...a great Dutch Man of War...was seen to sink...off of Orfordness...some days after, the Wrack of this Ship was seen by His Majesties Fleet as they passed...as was also another ...her Masts...standing out of the Water..."

So much for the portions of the episode that were, or may have been taken from the "Gazette". In the light of the plagiarisms which Colonel Parnell has shown, I venture to assert with little fear of contradiction that the similarities of the accounts in the "Memoirs" and the "Gazette" are due to more than accident, and that the author of the "Memoirs" has relied either upon the "Gazette" directly or else upon some intermediary work which had quite literally borrowed from the "Gazette".

We have, then, a portion of a book which pretends to be an authentic memoir, but which, upon examination, proves to contain

[1] The comment at the foot of the "Gazette's" list, "The Royal James was the only (English) Ship lost," is undoubtedly the original of the Memoirs' statement (p.5) that, "This (the Royal James) was the only Ship the English lost in this long Engagement."

a neglible amount of personal matter, by far the greater portion being merely a general account which could have been compiled from previously published records. One episode, indeed, that relating to the discovery of the Earl of Sandwich's body, contains, as we have seen, a considerable amount of fictitious matter. The work, then, has the appearance of a fabrication. Investigation of a limited number of earlier accounts reveals that what we had before only suspected is actually the case, and that the author of the "Memoirs" had borrowed liberally from at least one source, probably from two, and possibly from three or more. The account is not merely a fabrication - it is to a considerable degree a plagiarism.

Having determined that the account is not a genuine memoir, but fiction of no very honorable sort, we have now to discover who it was that thus used the name, and,to a very limited extent possibly, the activities of a real character as an occasion for the narrative. Carleton, it is evident, affords no sufficient basis for that authorship. It has been demonstrated that the author could not have been at Solebay, while Carleton, we have good reason to believe, was. At any rate, he had some experience at sea, and it is unquestionable that if he had been writing the "Memoirs", some of his own experiences would have been utilized, inasmuch as material was so scarce that it had to be digged piecemeal from the "Gazette" and from other sources.

It is to be emphasized that the clues to the real author lie in the amplifications of the borrowed materials. These amplifications as a rule do not reveal a familiarity with the small details

of the battle so much as a wide knowledge of affairs in general. The author knew, for instance, that Captain Digby, slain at Solebay, was "second Son to the Earl of Bristol"; that Lord Maidstone was "Son to the Earl of Winchelsea"; and that the Catherine was later commanded by the Earl of Mulgrave who, as Duke of Buckingham, had a picture of her painted in his house in St. James' Park. All this points to a Londoner, and a well-informed one, too. Sir Harry Dutton Colt is mentioned as having been aboard the Victory; Sir Harry lived in Westminister, where he was a justice; for years, also, he sat in parliament for the corporation of Westminister. In 1731, he died at his home in Pall Mall.

Carleton's home, it will be remembered, had been in Dublin for over thirty years previously to the publication of the "Memoirs". It appears probable that the author for whom we are searching will prove to have been some well-informed Londoner.

Chapter III

THE POSSIBLE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SOLEBAY EPISODE

Four years before the "Carleton Memoirs" were given to the world, that is, in 1724, a book, ostensibly of a far different nature from those memoirs but really very similar to them, was published. This work was entitled: "A TOUR thro' the whole Island of Great Britain...giving a...Diverting ACCOUNT of Whatever is CURIOUS and worth OBSERVATION...A DESCRIPTION of the Principal Cities and Towns...The...Diversions...of the People...The Sea Ports and Fortifications...(and) The...Seats, and Palaces of the NOBILITY and GENTRY..." The author was Daniel Defoe. Conformably to the title, Defoe, who had travelled widely in England, described the routes he took, and the places he passed through, and related historical incidents and anecdotes which he had heard about those places. Fortunately for our purposes, he visited and described the regions about Solebay and Harwich, as well as the country seats of a number of the notable men who figure in the account of the battle of Solebay given in the "Memoirs". More fortunately still, there is a long paragraph devoted to that very battle.[1]

> "This Town," Defoe writes of Southwold, "is made famous for a very great Engagement at Sea, in the Year 1672, between the English and Dutch Fleets, in the Bay opposite to the Town; in which, not to be partial to ourselves, the English Fleet was worsted; and the brave Montague Earl of Sandwich, Admiral under the Duke of York, lost his Life: The Ship Royal Prince, Carrying 100 Guns, in which he was, and which was under him, commanded by Sir Edward Spragg, was Burnt, and several other Ships lost,

[1] Letter i, p. 83. Unless otherwise stated, all references to the Tour are to vol. i.

> and about 600 Seamen; part of those killed in the Fight, were, as I was told, brought on Shore here and buried in the Churchyard of this Town, as others also were at Ipswich."

The paragraph has been quoted entire because it shows that Defoe was familiar with the battle and the circumstances connected with it. Writing from memory, he was inaccurate: Sandwich was not aboard the Royal Prince, but the Royal James, as we have seen; nor did Spragge command the Prince: he was in the Red Squadron, not the Blue, and commanded the London. Like the author of the "Memoirs", however, Defoe was under no delusions about who won the fight. Here, then, is evidence that Defoe knew at least the following facts about the battle of Solebay: (1) that it occurred in 1672 at Solebay; (2) that the English fleet was worsted; (3) that the Duke of York commanded; (4) that the Earl of Sandwich was one of the admirals and that he lost his life; (5) that Sir Edward Spragge commanded a vessel; (6) that the Prince was one of the vessels; (7) that several vessels were lost; (8) that about 600 seamen were slain; and (9) that part of the slain were buried at Southwold and at Ipswich. Of these nine items, the first seven appear in the "Memoirs".

It has been stated that the clue to the authorship of the Solebay narrative in the "Memoirs" lies in the amplifications of the material borrowed from the "Gazette". Of the general circumstances of the battle of Solebay, Defoe had, as we have just seen, a broad knowledge. The next step will be to determine whether or not he possessed the particular information and interest exemplified in the expansions referred to.

One of those amplifications we have already examined with

some care: that relating to the incidents connected with Carleton's journey to Holland in 1674 and with the finding of the Earl of Sandwich's body. The result of that examination was to throw the whole incident into a dubious light. In the first place, the author, by describing his hero as having pursued two distinct routes in this journey to Holland has made it appear extremely improbable that he really knew which route Carleton actually took; in the second place, the details of the incident prove to be most-embroiderings to the simple statement in the "Gazette" that the Earl's body had been picked up at sea and brought to Harwich. It is evident that to have fabricated the account, the author must have known at the very least that the regular route between England and Holland is by Harwich and the Brill; the more familiar he was with that fact, the more likely would it have been for the idea to have occurred to him. Let us see how far Defoe's acquaintance with Harwich and its packet boats extended.

It is interesting that he described Harwich at considerable length in his "Tour",[1] and mentioned having been there a number of times. Of the ample and well fortified harbor, enlarged by the inflowing of the Stour and the Orwel, he remarked[2] that great use had been made "in the old Dutch War", and added that he had "known ...100 Sail of Men of War...and between three and four hundred Sail of Collier Ships, all in this harbour at a time." "Harwich," he stated further,[3] "is known for being the Port where the Packet-

1 Letter i, pp. 47-51.
2 P. 48.
3 P. 49.

Boats, between England and Holland, go out and come in." There follows a paragraph of complaint about the sharp usage travellers receive at the hands of the inhabitants, which has resulted in the establishing of a passage directly from the Thames to Holland, and in the abandoning of the regular stage coach conveniences between London and Harwich. In another and earlier work of Defoe, the "Storm",[1] the phrase, "between Harwich and the Brill," almost duplicates that of the "Memoirs", "from Harwich to the Brill." Another small circumstance is not without significance; speaking of Carleton's passage, the "Memoirs" use the word "Pacquet Boats"; Defoe, in the "Tour", says "Packet-Boats"; while the "Gazette", Kennett's "History", and all the other accounts I have seen of the finding of Sandwich's body use the word "Ketches" or "Katches". In this instance, certainly, Defoe proves to have had sufficient knowledge for the fabrication of a significant addition to what the "Gazette" had reported.

We have seen that the account of the capture and recovery of the Catherine was taken almost verbatim from the "Gazette"; but the closing details are unquestionably contributions of the author of the "Memoirs". He goes on to relate the the Catherine was commanded in the next fight by the Earl of Mulgrave, later to be Duke of Buckingham, who had a picture of her painted in his house in St. James' Park. The Catherine was no new subject with Defoe, as Mr. Doble has pointed out.[2] He mentioned her in the "Tour";[3]

1 P. 264.

2 Academy, vol. 43 (1893), p. 439.

3 Letter ii, p. 25.

there, also, he spoke of the fine pictures in the Duke of Buckingham's house, remarking that "the Apartments are very noble, the furniture rich, and many very good Pictures." Mr. Doble further informs us that Defoe had described this house as early as 1705 in the "Dyet of Poland". The house in question had been built in 1703, just as Defoe was entering on his journalistic career.

There are not wanting indications that Defoe possessed the knowledge necessary for making the supplemental remarks concerning some of those mentioned in the casualty list. It has been stated that occasionally the "Memoirs" insert comments giving additional information about the killed. The "Gazette" gives Lord Maidstone's name without comment; but the "Memoirs" add that he was "Son to the Earl of Winchelsea..." Fortunately, we have good reason to believe that Defoe knew of this relationship; describing a place near Maidstone in the "Tour",[1] he remarks that it is the seat of the Earl of Winchelsea. Nothing, then, would be more natural than that when, four years later, he came across the name of Lord Maidstone in the "Gazette's" casualty list, he should supplement the bare mention of the name with some information which he possessed of that Lord's family connection.

[1] Letter ii, p. 36.

[2] The Memoirs list "Captain Saddleton of the Dartmouth" among the slain. Captain Sadlington (not Saddleton) was not killed at Solebay, however.(Calendar of S.P.,d.s., May-Sept.,1672,p.313). Neither he nor the Dartmouth are mentioned in the Gazette's account of the battle. Frequently, as in his account of Solebay in the Tour, Defoe was led into error through too great reliance on his memory.

Another statement in the Memoirs which may or may not be false is that Sir Frescheville Hollis "lost one of his Arms in the war before, and his Life in this." The writer in the Dictionary of National Biography is not sure that Hollis was so disfigured.

Passing on to the informational paragraph devoted to Sir George Rooke, the Earls of Orford and Torrington, and Sir Harry Dutton Colt, it is scarcely necessary to state that each of these men were prominent figures of Defoe's day, and that, especially to a Londoner, the general facts of their lives would be known. The first three, all famous naval commanders, as has been remarked, are mentioned in the "Tour".[1] Describing Canterbury, Defoe names among its great families that of "Sir George Rook, famous for his Services at Sea against the French," and quotes the doggerel lines, "made by some of the Merry Wits of that Time," beginning,

"The Great Tourville Sir George did Beat,
The Great Sir George Beat him..."

Of Orford, Defoe remarks: "...we saw a noble Seat of the Late Admiral Russel, now Earl of Orford;"[2] and he comments on the great naval victory Russel won at La Hogue (Barfleur) in 1692, which as it happens is described later on in the "Memoirs". Herbert (Earl of Torrington), Defoe mentions[3] in connection with the place near which he cautiously refused to permit the English fleet to join with the Dutch in an injudicious attack on the French; a long paragraph is given to the episode, and to a defense of Torrington's conduct. It is of interest to know further that both Orford and Torrington were connected with the expedition of William of Orange to England in 1688. Torrington commanded the Prince's fleet on the way from Holland, and Orford joined his forces soon after they landed in England. Likewise, Daniel Defoe, having in some unac-

1 Letter iii, p. 43.
2 Letter i, p. 113.
3 Letter ii, pp. 51,52.

countable manner escaped with his life from participation in the Monmouth Rebellion three years earlier, was among those who welcomed the new king and who marched to the capital with him.[1]

Defoe's interest in Orford, and, also, in the Duke of Buckingham, (mentioned above, and in the "Memoirs", p. 5), would beyond question be increased from their having been named (1706) as members of the commission to arrange the union with Scotland, a project to which Defoe lent his best energy for a number of years, and the success of which was due in no small degree to his patient and dogged efforts. The last named of the four, Sir Harry Dutton Colt, as has been remarked, was a well-known magistrate about London, and consequently no stranger to a widely informed journalist such as Defoe was.

There remain some minor items still to be pointed out. The second paragraph of the "Memoirs" opens: "The Fleet set Sail from the...Nore...to join the French...in St. Hellens Road." The essential facts stated here were accessible in the "Gazette", and were doubtless taken from it; but beyond that, Defoe, as any Englishman might be, was well acquainted with both St. Helen's and the Nore. He remarked of Sheerness[2] that the officers are "often oblig'd to be here many Days together; especially when the Rendezvous of the Fleet is at the Nore. " Likewise, he stated of the

[1] The Memoirs seem to be in error again in giving the Monck as the vessel commanded by Torrington at Solebay. The Dictionary of National Biography says that he commanded the Dreadnought, and, though frequently inaccurate in such matters, it here appears to be correct. (See Cal. of S.P., d.s., May-Sept;,1672, p.89).

[2] Tour, Letter ii, pp. 27,28.

Earl of Scarborough's seat at Stansted, that from its dining room can be seen "the Ships...at St. Helens; which when the Royal Navy happens to be there...is a most glorious Sight."[1] The Nore and St. Helen's are mentioned on the same page of the "Storm".[2]

The "Gazette" mentions the Galloper without saying what it is, whereas the "Memoirs"[3] speak of it as a sand upon which the Charles was lost in the previous war. In the "Storm",[4] Defoe calls the Galloper "a very dangerous Sand." That Defoe was, also, familiar with the Charles has been shown by Mr. Doble,[5] who quotes Defoe's remark[6] that the Charles is "a first-rate ship, being of a reddish colour, different either from brass or copper."

This completes the list of amplifications of the borrowed accounts which require the possession of additional knowledge on the part of the author of the "Memoirs". In every case, we find that Defoe not only had that additional information, but that he had used that information in his other writings. By itself this fact might have no great significance; Defoe was not the only man in England who was widely informed. At any rate, we have an author who had produced a number of works similar in character to the "Memoirs", and who possessed the necessary information and interests to have written the "Memoirs", also. We have, moreover,

1 Tour, Letter ii, p. 71.

2 P. 65.

3 P.2.

4 P.218.

5 Academy, vol. 43 (1893), p.439. In this connection, Mr. Doble points out that the Charles was not lost on the Galloper.

6 Projects, p. 32.

evidence that both Defoe and the author of the "Memoirs" associated similar ideas with the places and events mentioned in the Solebay episode.

It has been mentioned that the anecdote of Sir Edward Spragge's pigeons, related in the "Memoirs", is placed at the very end of the Solebay episode: having described the battle, given the casualty list, and mentioned the Dutch losses, and being ready to have his hero quit the fleet, the author launches on the pigeon story. It is more than a coincidence, perhaps, that Defoe, in the paragraph immediately following his account of the battle of Solebay in his "Tour", likewise tells a remarkable incident about birds, which he claims to have witnessed at Southwold. The anecdotes differ somewhat; but they, also, have many points in common. It is necessary to quote both quite literally.

"Memoirs", pp. 9,10.

> "I CANNOT here omit one Thing, which to some may seem trifling; though I am apt to think our Naturalists may have a different Opinion of it, and find it afford their Fansies no undiverting Employment...We had on board the London...a great Number of Pidgeons, of which our Commander was very fond. These, on the firing of our Cannon, dispers'd...and were seen no where near us during the Fight. The next Day...a brisk Gale...drove our Fleet some Leagues to the Southward...yet the Day after they all returned safe aboard; not in one Flock, but in small Parties of four or five at a Time. Some Persons...admiring at the Manner of their Return...Sir Edward Sprage told them, That he brought those Pidgeons with him from the Streights; and that...when he left the Revenge ...to go aboard the London, all those Pidgeons, of their own accord...left the Revenge likewise, and removed on board the London, where I say them... What Sort of Instinct this could proceed from, I leave to the Curious."

Defoe's "Tour", Letter 1, p. 83ff.

> "...I think the following Remark, tho' of so trifling a Circumstance, may be both Instructing, as well as Diverting...I was some Years before at this Place...and observ'd in the evening an unusual Multitude of Birds sitting on...the Church; Curiosity led me to go nearer to see what they were, and I found they were all Swallows; that there was such an infinite Number that they cover'd the whole Roof... this led me to Enquire of a grave Gentleman...what the meaning was of such a prodigious Multitude of Swallows...I perceive, Sir, says he, you are a Stranger to it; You must then understand...that this is the Season...when the Swallows...return to the Country...from whence...they came; and this being the nearest to the Coast of Holland, they come here to Embark; this he said Smiling a little, and now Sir, says he, the Weather being too calm, or the wind contrary, they are waiting for a Gale, for they are all Wind-bound.
>
> "This was more evident...when in the Morning I found the Wind had come about to North-west in the Night, and there was not one Swallow to be seen, of near a Million, which I believe was there the Night before.
>
> "How those Creatures know that this...is the Way to their Home...We must leave to the Naturalists... ..."

Is it not strange that two authors should tell two stories of similar character and connect them, not only with the same region, but, also, with the same event? Both Defoe and the author of the "Memoirs" associate birds with the idea of Southwold. Attention should be called to the fact that the similarity of the two anecdotes extends even to the phraseology employed; in each case, the author has emphasized the large number of fowls, and has the point of interest lie in the question of instinct which guides their movements. Both, furthermore, begin with the apology that though the circumstance may appear trifling it is diverting, and end with statements that are almost word for word the same: that of the "Memoirs" is, "I leave to the Curious;" and Defoe's,

"We must leave to the Naturalists." The inference that Defoe, having fabricated the Carleton account of Solebay, and desiring to give the atmosphere of genuine memoir to what is otherwise a common-place history, had recourse to the ideas which he had connected with Southwold in the "Tour", written four years previously, can hardly be evaded. Obviously, the story of the swallows could not be repeated; so a similar one was substituted.

Not only does Defoe possess the requisite knowledge and interests for the composition of this Solebay episode, but he and the author of that episode have similar association of ideas. Both associate packet boats with Harwich, and birds with Southwold. Attention now will be called to the presence of a number of Defoe's favorite ideas in the narrative.

There is the story of the cowardly duellist, related on page 6. Commenting on this duellist, the author of the "Memoirs" says:

> "There is a bravery of Mind which I fansy few of those Gentleman Duellists are possess'd of. True Courage cannot proceed from what Sir Walter Raleigh finely calls the Art or Philosophy of Quarrel. No! It must be the issue of Principle, and can have no other Basis than a steady Tenet of Religion."

Parallels for this discussion of duelling and true courage are common with Defoe. Take, for example, the instance in "Duncan Campbell"[1] where, speaking of the misfortunes of younger brothers, Defoe remarks that they "run themselves into Debt...and then in Quarrel, they, or some other Gentleman, may be, is run through... their very Pride...subjects them too often to the lowest and meanest Acts; and their Courage...turns into a brutish and savage Rage."[2] At another place in the same work, he speaks of an ambush's

[1]Ed. 1720, pp. 213,214. [2]P. 162.

being arranged with much false courage.

I am indebted again to Mr. Doble[1] for these further instances. In the "Journal of the Plague Year" (ed. Cassels, p.120), Defoe remarks, "The poor...went about their employment, with a sort of brutal courage; I must call it so, for it was founded neither on religion or prudence." A similar assertion is quoted by Walter Wilson[2] from the preface to volume eight of Defoe's "Review": "I question whether there is much, if any difference between bravery and cowardice, but what is founded in the principle they are engaged for." Again, there are the verses from the "Serious Reflections of Robinson Crusoe" (p.28):

> "Among the worst of cowards let him be nam'd,
> Who having sinn'd's afraid to be asham'd;
> And to mistaken courage he's betray'd,
> Who having sinn'd's asham'd to be afraid."[3]

The duellist referred to in the anecdote, Mr. Doble thinks must have been some well-known person; for Warner's "Epistolatory Curiosities" (1st series, p.129) quotes a letter dated March 10th, 1684(5), stating that the new king "says, he knows a man hath fought nine duells, and is a very coward, having been manifestly knowne such in an engagement att sea." Again, we are confronted with a possible element of truth in what appears to be unadulterated fiction. The new king referred to could be none other than the admiral who commanded at Solebay, for the Duke of York had become James II on February 6, 1685, barely a month before the

[1] Academy, May 20, 1893, p. 439.

[2] Defoe, iii, 294.

[3] Further cases cited by Mr. Doble are: History of the Devil, p.293; Lee, Defoe, iii, pp.124,296; and Colonel Jacque, p. 450.

letter was written.

The mention of Sir Walter Raleigh's name by the author of the "Memoirs" is significant, as Raleigh was one of Defoe's favorite authors; his "History of the World" was among the books found in Defoe's library after his death.[1] Mr. Doble is authority for the further information that the reference in the "Memoirs" is to the "History of the World"[2], and that Defoe had mentioned Raleigh in at least eight of his other works, always with the highest praise.[3]

It might be thought by some that Defoe, the author of the "True-Born Englishman", and a strong supporter of King William, and of the Hanoverian Succession, would not have undertaken the defense of the Duke of York's conduct, or have praised his bravery, as the author of the "Memoirs" has done. On the contrary, however, Defoe would have been likely to do such a thing, and as a matter of fact did do so in the "Tour", in terms highly suggestive of the "Memoirs". "I am very sensible," remarks the author of the "Memoirs" (p.4), "later Times have not been over favourable in their Sentiments of that unfortunate Prince's Valour, yet I cannot omit the doing a Piece of Justice to his

[1] Mr. Aitken, Athenaeum, June 1, 1895. Unfortunately, Defoe's library was catalogued for sale with that of a clergyman, and there is now no way to be absolutely certain as to whether a particular book was in the library of Defoe or that of the clergyman. There is little reason for uncertainty, however, in the case of Raleigh's History.

[2] Ed. Oxford, vol. vi, p. 459.

[3] Tour, i,iii,85; iii,263; System of Magic, (ed.1840),18,31; History of the Devil, (ed. Bohn), 533; Works, ii,61,284; Storm,4; Plan of the English Commerce, xiii,148; Serious Reflections,244; and the Review, i, 145.

Memory." In the "Tour" (ii,31), Defoe, speaking of the place where James II was made prisoner in his flight of 1688, says: "... I must mention it to the Reproach of the People of Feversham, let the conduct of that Unfortunate Prince be what it will, that the...Rabble can never be excus'd, who treated the King...with the utmost indecency...till some Neighboring Gentlemen...who understood their Duty better...preserv'd (him) from farther Violence ..."

Consider further the additions to the "Gazette's" report of the finding of the Earl of Sandwich's body. We have seen that, whereas the "Gazette" announced merely that the body was "discovered floating on the Sea," the "Memoirs" explain how that discovery came to be amde: the finders were led to it by the great flock of gulls which hovered over the body, - an explanation which has been shown to be contrary to the facts in the case. Those who are familiar with the use Defoe appears to have made of the journal of Selkirk in writing his "Robinson Crusoe" will recall that Selkirk claims that there were cats on his island, and that Defoe renders that simple statement more credible by explaining how the cats came to be there. This use of details to give verisimilitude is a commomplace of Defoe criticism, and will account for the further supplementing of the incident in the "Memoirs".

Not content with simply having the body brought ashore, the author must again give a significantly realistic touch by relating that there was "between twenty and thirty Guineas, some Silver, and his Gold Watch" found on the body. To anyone who remembers the evident pleasure with which Defoe's characters mention sums

of money, this sentence will not be without significance; pieces of eight, louis d'or, guineas, pounds sterling, and other terms for money are frequent in their mouths. The gaining of money is the chief pursuit of Moll Flanders, Roxana, Colonel Jacque, Captain Singleton, and many other of his rogues during some parts of their careers. In the "Tour" (i,109), Defoe says of a certain place, "We saw...every Man busie in the main Affair of Life, that is to say, getting Money..." In the same work he is constantly mentioning and comparing the prices of different commodities. Not only had he been in a mercantile business himself, but he had written many pamphlets on the state of commerce. But quite common, also, among the rogues of Defoe, is the mention of gold watches; a famous scene in "Moll Flanders" is the one in which she bestows a gold watch on her son: "I did not, indeed," says she, "tell him I stole it from a gentle-woman's side, at a meeting house in London."[1]

Attention should be called to the fact that, according to the "Memoirs", the sailors were rewarded for their honesty in returning the Earl's property to his lady: they were allowed to keep all the gold and silver. With this should also be considered the statement in the succeeding paragraph concerning the sailors on board the Catherine; it will be remembered that they had seized an opportunity to recover control of their vessel after it had been captured by the Dutch, and had brought it back to the English fleet with some Dutch prisoners. All this is clearly from the "Gazette". But the "Memoirs" give the additional touch that for their brave conduct "as they deserv'd, they were well rewarded."

[1] Vol. ii, (Maynadier edition, pp. 209, 210).

Twice on the same page, the author has rounded out a borrowed narrative with the realistic detail that the protagonists were rewarded for their conduct. No effort has been made to find parallel instances in acknowledged works of Defoe, though unquestionably many of them might easily be found. One instance from the "Tour" (iii,115) may, however, be cited. It was during the great storm of November 27th, 1703, (and, indeed, Defoe had first related the incident in his famous account of that storm, p.196), that a ship laden with tin was swept from her moorings with only a man and two boys aboard; by the bold efforts of one of the boys, the vessel was finally guided into a cove where she sank. The three sailors, however, escaped, and the cargo was ultimately recovered. In both accounts of the episode, Defoe mentions that the sailors were rewarded; the first version (from the "Storm") ends with a bit of doggerel, "they were well gratified, and the Merchants well satisfied;" while the second (from the "Tour") closes with a postscript stating that the owners of the cargo "very well Rewarded the three sailors, especially the lad that ran her into the place."

But these first pages of the "Memoirs" give not only a number of examples of Defoe's favorite ideas; they also abound in instances of his literary mannerisms. The fact is, that Defoe has left his signature on every page, and in nearly every paragraph and sentence in the "Memoirs". It should be remembered that while many of these mannerisms were doubtless used by other writers of that time, it would indeed be strange to find all of them in any one other author; especially in company with so many of Defoe's

favorite ideas.

There are two formulas in the "Memoirs" with which incidents are, in general, introduced; one of these is the phrase, "I cannot (or must not) omit here;" the other is, "I remember." The first, apparently, is used when the author is inserting an anecdote of his own in what he considers a fitting place for it; the second, when he is trying to give an air of genuineness to incidents which he is borrowing from written sources.

The anecdote of Sir Edward Spragge's pigeons begins with the phrase, "I cannot here omit one Thing" ; four pages earlier (5), a story of a wounded man devoured by hogs aboard the Catherine is introduced similarly: "I must not omit one remarkable Occurrence." Other instances follow: (109), "I cannot here omit one Singularity of Life;" (121), "I cannot here omit one very remarkable Instance of...Catholic Zeal;" (122), "Another remarkable Accident...I must recite;" and (311), "I cannot here omit an accidental Converation."

Defoe had used this same phrase repeatedly in the "Tour". Three pages beyond the story of the swallows, but while still dealing with the region about Southwold, he relates the following circumstance (i,87): "I cannot omit, however little it may seem, that ...Suffolk is particularly famous for furnishing...London with Turkeys...tho' this may be reckon'd a trifling Thing...yet...I could not omit it." Here we have Defoe twice using the formula, "I cannot omit," and twice apologizing lest the matter seem trifling, as the author of the "Memoirs" has done in the case of Spragge's pigeons. Other instances in the "Tour" are: (iii,62), "I cannot omit here a small Adventure;" (iii,93), "One Thing...I cannot

omit;" (iii,77), "It cannot pass my Observation here;" and (iii, 78), "I cannot omit a short Story here."

This method of introducing anecdotes Defoe had used twenty years earlier than the publication of the "Tour".[1] In the "Storm", he says: (77), "Another Observation I cannot but make;" (199), "And here I cannot omit;" and (271), "One unhappy Accident I cannot omit." In "Duncan Campbell", the phrase is varied somewhat, the usual form being, "I must let the Reader know," or "Now I must tell the Reader." Such expressions are of frequent occurrence there; two examples may be found on page 124, and another on page 140.

Passing on to the second method of introducing incidents, it will be recalled that the casualty list in the "Memoirs" was given "as I remember" it. Other instances follow: (30), "I remember the Prince of Orange...receiv'd a Shot through his Arm;" (31), "I remember the Dutch Troops did not all alike do their Duty;" (193), "I remember we were not marched very far;" (221), "I remember one of those reverend old Men;" (225), "I remember upon some further ...Conversation;" and (314), "I remember not to have seen any Horses."

This same phrase is sufficiently plentiful in the acknowledged writings of Defoe. In "Duncan Campbell", we find: (69), "...I remember, when he was about nine Years of Age (that he did so and so);" (106), "I remember to have read;" (211), "I remember, I writ down...the Moral Story;" (226), "I remember the Passage;" (240), "I remember Mr. Dryden makes a very beautiful Observation;"

[1] All references to the Storm are to the original edition.

and (282), "I remember, one of the Ingredients was..." One example from the "Tour" may be cited (i,131), "I remember some Years a Brewer..."

The author of the "Memoirs" has a trite manner of introducing quotations; such as, "What Sir Walter Raleigh finely calls," "the immortal Shakespeare," and "the excellent Hudibras." Mr. Doble has called attention to this,[1] and has cited a number of examples of the use of that manner by Defoe. From "Duncan Campbell" I have selected the few instances which follow: (112), "The famous Torquatus Tasso...scarce inferior to the immortal Virgil;" (193), "The learned Camerarius;" and (198), "...so many Learned... and Noble Authors."

Attention has been called to the expression at the end of the pigeon anecdote in the "Memoirs" (10): "What Sort of Instinct this could proceed from, I leave to the Curious;" and to the corresponding one at the end of the swallow anecdote in Defoe's "Tour": "How those Creatures know...this...we must leave to the Naturalists." Similar expressions appear elsewhere in the "Memoirs", and are not uncommon in other writings of Defoe. On page 235 of the "Memoirs" we find this remark: "...whether weary with gorging, or over-thirsty with devouring, I leave to Philosophers." Similarly, in the "Tour" (i,119), Defoe has written: "...whether it be that the Country has so little worth speaking of... or that the Town has so much...I leave to others." In "Duncan Campbell", likewise, he says: (78), "I shall leave them to the Labyrinth of their own wild Opinions;" and (242), "I leave that...to Writers of Fable and

[1] Academy, vol. 43 (1893), p. 439.

Romance."

The last of these expressions which shall be considered here, is the use of the phrase "admiring at" to mean "wondering at". The author of the "Memoirs" speaks of some persons "admiring at" the manner in which Sir Edward's pigeons returned aboard the London. Two similar uses of the expression have been selected from a casual glancing through "Duncan Campbell"; (61), "We may the less admire at the Wonder;" and (98), "...she...sung so melodiously... that her Musick-Master...admir'd at it."

The fact is that Defoe, as a prolific journalist, had command of such a large number of words and phrases affected by the writers of his day that our search for evidences of his pen in the matter of diction resolves itself to some extent into an effort to show that the "Memoirs" exhibit a sufficiently large proportion of those words and expressions to justify us in considering him as the author.

Passing from the mannerisms and phraseology to the vocabulary of the "Memoirs", we discover a number of words which, if not distinctive of Defoe, occur frequently enough in his works, to aid in confirming the evidence for his authorship already produced. Consider the adjective "prodigious" used on page 10 of the "Memoirs"; on page 323, the author speaks of a "prodigious Pile"; and on page 345, of a "prodigious Fish". "Prodigious" is one of Defoe's favorite adjectives. In "Duncan Campbell" he writes (227) of "prodigious Acts"; and in the "Storm" (38), of a "prodigious Tide", and (240), of a "prodigious Noise". In the "Tour", he uses the adverb "prodigiously". There, also, he speaks of a "prodigious

Multitude of Swallows", as we have seen in the anecdote of the Solebay swallows.

At the close of the episode, the "Memoirs" mention that the king found himself under the necessity of "clapping up" a speedy peace with Holland. "Clapping up" is striking enough; in "Duncan Campbell" Defoe has a like expression (210), where he asks when we shall see the happy day in which old heads shall "be clapp'd" on young shoulders.[1]

Stronger or more varied evidence that Defoe was the author of the first episode of these spurious memoirs could hardly be hoped for in a ten page narrative. That he could have written them there can be no question. The paragraph quoted from the "Tour" makes clear that he had a broad general knowledge of the battle of Solebay; while other instances have demonstrated that he possessed the information and interests necessary for writing the portions supplementing the materials borrowed from the "Gazette". A study of the episode, moreover, reveals that its author and Defoe have similar associations of ideas; that they have similar favorite ideas; and that they have a great deal in common in the matter of diction.

But, after all, the study has covered less than one thirty-

[1] Other words to be found in these first few pages of the Memoirs that are of frequent occurrence in Defoe's works are:
1. "Nobility and Gentry" (p.1); this phrase appears some half-dozen times in the Tour (i,90;ii,55,107;iii,14).
2. "Naturalists" (p.9);quoted in Defoe's anecdote of the swallowsin the Tour. Mr. Doble (Academy, vol. 43, 1893, p.439) has pointed out the following other instances of its use by Defoe: Storm (12), History of the Devil (238), Robinson Crusoe, (i,223), Roxana (Bohn,195), and Lee's Defoe (ii,286). Only two instances of its use are found in the writings of Swift.

fifth of the whole work, and there is no need to push conclusions too far at this point. All that is necessary is to make certain that, in the absence of any other likely claimant for the authorship, Defoe could have been the author. Carleton, we have seen, affords no basis for supposing that he produced such a work of fiction; and Mr. Doble has made it clear that Dean Swift could not have written it. No other possibilities have been very seriously proposed. Considering that Defoe has produced a number of similar works which long passed for authentic memoirs; that he was in London and actively engaged in writing in 1728; and that every clue discoverable in this first episode points to him, we must be content for the present with the conclusion that, whatever may be the case in later portions of the work, this first episode of the "Memoirs of Captain Carleton" contains a minimum of basis in Carleton's acvities, that it is almost wholly a fabrication, and that its author was probably Daniel Defoe.

At the outset of this investigation we were confronted with a work which purported to be a genuine memoir but which was known to contain passages of a fictitious nature. Considerable internal evidence, moreover, had been produced which seemed to indicate that Defoe had the principal share in its composition. As to that, however, the majority of investigators had remained unconvinced, and some had even reasserted a belief that the "Memoirs" are genuine. But even those who insisted most strenuously that they are fraudulent have conceded that their author had before him some manuscript or notes written or dictated by Carleton. Lockhart's grudging admission that Defoe may have been their author

is accompanied by the assertion that "he no doubt had before him the rude journal of some officer who fought and bled in the campaigns described with such an inimitable air of truth."[1] Likewise, Mr. Doble, who had no doubt that Carleton was only a cloak for Defoe, was equally certain that "Defoe, after his manner, worked up Carleton's anecdotes and reminiscences into literary shape."[2] In accord with this opinion is that of Colonel Parnell, who argued so tenaciously that Swift rather than Defoe was the fabricator of the work ascribed to Carleton; Parnell's conclusion was that Carleton had personally interviewed Dean Swift and had furnished him with data.[3] A more conservative attitude is that of Professor Trent;[4] while thoroughly convinced of "Defoe's connection with the book in some capacity or other", he believes that "we cannot now determine with any certainty" whether Defoe "edited with considerable rewriting a manuscript written by Carleton himself, or by some one in Dublin acting under Carleton's direction...whether he merely utilized Carleton's memoranda and conversations, or whether he made up the entire book on his knowledge of the events of the period and on a few hints with regard to Carleton's personality and career derived from some unknown source."

With matters in this state, the first episode, a ten page narrative which has hitherto received little attention, has been

1 Life of Scott, vol.iii, (ed. 1902, p.74).

2 Academy, vol. 43 (1893), p. 483.

3 English Historical Review, vol. vi (1891), p. 97ff.

4 Daniel Defoe, pp. 262-4.

subjected to a critical examination, the result of which has been to show that by far the greater portion of that narrative was plagiarized from the "London Gazette"; and that the rest is partly truthful and partly fictitious embroiderings to the plagiarized materials. One of the main incidents, indeed, proves to be wholly, and probably intentionally, untruthful. It has, moreover, been established almost beyond question that Carleton could not have composed this portion of the narrative, and considerable evidence has been presented to settle the authorship upon Defoe.

But the most significant fact discovered, perhaps, has to do with the relation of Carleton's personal activity to this part of the narrative which he is claimed to have written. We have seen that even those who deny the authenticity of the "Memoirs" were of the opinion that Carleton had contributed data which was of use in their composition. It appears extremely unlikely, however, that any considerable amount of such data was at hand during the writing of this episode. At the most, the author could have known only the questionable fact that Carleton was with Spragge in the battle of Solebay and that he left the fleet not long afterward; and he probably knew even less: perhaps only that at some time in his youth Carleton had served under Spragge.[1]

[1] It is my intention to continue, in the near future, this study of the Carleton Memoirs, and to subject as great a portion of them as is practicable to a similar scrutiny.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academy, 1888, 1889, 1893.

Athenaeum, 1895, 1889, 1903, 1914.

Baker, E.A., Guide to the Best Fiction in English, London, 1913.

Barrington, Michael, Grahame of Claverhouse, London, 1911.

Bernbaum, Ernest, The Mary Carleton Narratives, Cambridge (Mass.), 1914.

Bibliotheca Smithiana, seu Catalogus Librorum D. Josephi Smithii Anglii, Venetiis, 1755.

Boswell, James, Life of Samuel Johnson, Oxford, v.4, 1887.

Boyer, Abel, History of King William III, London, v.1, 1702.

Burton, John Hill, History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Edinburgh, v.2, 1880.

Calendar of State Papers, dom. ser., May 18 to Sept. 30, 1672, London, 1899.

Cambridge History of English Literature, Cambridge, v.9, 1913.

Cambridge Modern History, New York and London, v.5, 1909.

Carleton, Percival A., Memorials of the Carleton Family, London, 1869.

Craik, G.L., Compendium History of English Literature and of the English Language from the Norman Conquest, New York, v.2, 1866.

Dartmouth Manuscripts (Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fifteenth Report, Appendix, Part I), London, v.3, 1897.

Defoe, Daniel, Duncan Campbell, London, 1720.
Moll Flanders, New York and London, v.2,1903.
Robinson Crusoe, London, v.1, 1899.
Storm, London, 1704.
Tour, London, v.1, 1724.

Dictionary of National Biography, New York, vols. 3 and 8, 1908.

English Historical Review, 1891.

Esdaile, Arundell, List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740, London, 1912.

Fortescue, J.W., History of the British Army, London, v.1, 1899.

Kennett, White, Complete History of England, London, v.3, 1706.

Lee, William, Life and Newly Discovered Writings of Daniel Defoe, London, v.1, 1869.

Lockhart, John Gibson, Life of Sir Walter Scott, Edinburgh, v.3, 1902.
London Gazette, 1672.

Lowndes, W.T., Bibliographers Manual, London, v.1, 1857.

Marvell, Andrew, Works, London, v.4, 1875.

Notes and Queries, 2nd ser., vols.6 and 7; 3rd ser., v.6.

Parker, Samuel, History of his own Times, London, 1727.

Political History of England (Hunt and Poole, Editors), London, v.9, 1906.
Post Boy, 1728.

Rice-Oxley, Leonard, Memoirs as a Source of English History (The Stanhope Essay, 1914), Oxford, 1914.
Stanhope, Philip Henry, 5th Earl, History of England comprising the Reign of Queen Anne, London, v.1, 1872.
Stanhope, Philip Henry, 5th Earl, History of the War of Succession in Spain, London, 1832.
Stebbing, William, Peterborough, London, 1890.

Stephen, Sir Leslie, Hours in a Library, London, v.1, 1907.

Trent, W.P., Daniel Defoe, Indianapolis, 1916.

Wilson, Walter, Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, London, v.3, 1830.
Wyon, F.W., History of Great Britain during the Reign of Queen Anne, London, v.1, 1876.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 086833701